

129108

JPRS-UKO-84-007

23 March 1984

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 1, January 1984

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

19990917 062

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

14
162
A08

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

23 March 1984

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 1, January 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum	1
Text of Address by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary	3
On the Draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and Draft State Budget of the USSR for 1984	13
Some Questions of the Work of the Soviets of People's Deputies at the Contemporary Stage (V. Kuznetsov)	16
The Torchbearer of the Revolutionary Era	32
Leninist Concept of Trade Unions Under Socialism and Ideological Struggle (G. Alekseyev)	44
Equipment of the Agricultural Worker (P. Guzhvin)	57
Automatic Control System in a Rural Rayon (L. Giginayshvili, A. Kobaidze, Kh. Repp)	71
Historical Fate of Social Antagonisms (Yu. Zhdanov)	85
Never-Ending Source of Inspiration (Kaarel Ird)	100

Intervention Syndrome and Lessons of History (V. Mal'kov, B. Marushkin)	108
System of Violence and Wars; The United States Through the Eyes of an American Journalist	118
Elections and Politics (Andrew Rothstein)	129
Cheap Show (Melor Sturua)	135
Scorching Lines (V. Arkhipenko)	148
Short Book Reviews (M. Glotov)	154
Bookshelf	156

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 1
January 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : January 1984

Signed to press : 3 Jan 1984

Copies : 915,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1984

INFORMATION REPORT ON THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

PM262054 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84)
p 3

[Text] A regular plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee began its work 26 December 1983.

The plenary meeting heard reports by Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR N. K. Baybakov "On the State Plan of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1984" and the Minister of Finance of the USSR V. F. Garbuzov "On the State Budget of the USSR in 1984."

It was with much attention that the participants in the plenary meeting acquainted themselves with the text of a speech by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yu. V. Andropov. The speakers in the discussion voiced full support for the provisions and conclusions contained in this important political document noting that they are of principled importance and should be placed at the base of the activity of all party, soviet and economic bodies, public organizations, and labor collectives.

The text of the speech of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov is published in the press.

Speaking in the discussion were Comrades V. V. Grishin, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; A. P. Lyashko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers; N. N. Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; K. M. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; P. P. Grishkyavichus, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; L. N. Zaykov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom; A. Askarov, first secretary of the Chimkent Obkom of the Kazakhstan Communist Party; M. S. Gorbachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; S. A. Afanasyev, minister of heavy and transport machine building; A. V. Vlasov, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush Obkom; and L. A. Gorshkov, first secretary of the Kemerovo Obkom.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee examined organizational questions.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee made Comrades V. I. Vorotnikov and M. S. Solomentsev, who were candidate members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, full members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The Central Committee plenum elected CPSU Central Committee member Comrade V. M. Chebrikov to candidate membership of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee elected member of the CPSU Central Committee Comrade Ye. K. Ligachev secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

On 27 December 1983 the CPSU Central Committee plenum continued its work. Taking part in the debates on the report by Comrade N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, "On the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1984" and on the report by Comrade V. F. Garbuzov, USSR minister of finance, "On the State Budget of the USSR for 1984," were the following: Comrade V. K. Gusev, first secretary of the Saratov Obkom; N. A. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; G. S. Bashtanyuk, fitters' and adjusters' brigade leader at the Kama Association Foundry Works for the production of large-capacity trucks (KamAZ) in the Tatar ASSR; L. V. Radyukevich, director of the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Combine; M. S. Gromova, machine milking foreman at the Kommunarka State Pedigree Stockbreeding Farm in Moscow Oblast; P. F. Lomako, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy, and D. I. Kachin, first secretary of Kamchatka Obkom.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum unanimously adopted a resolution on the questions debated, which is published in the press.

The plenum then ended its work.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/7

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY YU. V. ANDROPOV, CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE GENERAL SECRETARY

PM262012 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84)
pp 4-11

[Text] Dear Comrades!

I deeply regret that because of temporary causes I will not be able to attend the session of the plenum. But I have attentively studied all the materials that form the basis of the plan for the coming year. I gave them much thought and was preparing to speak and outline some of my considerations. That is why I am sending the text of my speech to the members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee, members of the Central Auditing Commission, participants in the plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee.

As you know, with due account for the exchange of views that had taken place, the Politburo of the Central Committee has decided to submit to you for discussion the drafts of the plan and budget for 1984 that were drawn up by the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The questions that the plenary session is to study are vitally important for the country. It is of much political importance that simultaneously with the setting of tasks for the future we are assessing the fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th Congress, summing up the results of the work done in the period since the November 1982 Plenum of the Central Committee and analyzing accomplishments and shortcomings in order to make correct conclusions for the future.

The implementation of some measures to perfect our economic management, enhance organization, strengthen state, labor and plan discipline has been started in the country this year.

This has facilitated in many ways the success in improving the state of affairs in a number of sectors within a comparatively short period of time, in enhancing the initiative and responsibility of cadres, their confidence in their strength and in raising the creative activity of the masses. This course has got the full approval and support of communists, of all working people.

People have begun working with a better mood. The rates of economic growth increased, and quality indicators have somewhat risen. In general, a change for the better in the national economy has begun to show. All this confirms

that the correctness of the line has been worked out, the practicability and substantiated nature of the tasks set by the party to develop the economy and to overcome the existing difficulties.

As we see, the results are manifest. But this is only the beginning. The most important thing now is not to lose the tempo and the general positive mood for action, and more actively to develop positive processes.

An analysis of the planned targets for 1984 shows that the planned rates and proportions conform in the main to these tasks and consolidate the positive tendencies of the current year. I think that comrades will agree with that. The plan to a greater extent than previously is oriented towards raising the efficiency of production. Its social orientation is being intensified. Everything necessary has been envisaged to maintain the country's defense capacity at a proper level. Thus, the draft plan meets the political and economic strategy of the party and, I believe, can be endorsed by the plenum.

In several days' time, upon being endorsed by the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the plan will become a law of economic life of all the branches of the economy, of thousands of enterprises, associations, and organizations. It will serve as a determinant of the working rhythm of the production shops, sectors, production teams, and of millions of workers, of all those who through dedicated labor create material and intellectual values and strengthen the might of our motherland.

In the conditions of the present international situation, which has been sharply aggravated through the fault of the aggressive imperialist circles, the strict implementation of the State Plan becomes not just an obligation but also a patriotic duty of every Soviet person, each work collective, and each party and public organization.

It is very important that a good start be made from the first days of the new year and that one get disposed towards a further increase of intensity in work, without allowances for difficulties, of which there are a good deal ahead.

It is essential, to begin with, to focus attention on the most urgent matters, the so-called bottlenecks, on the solution of which the success of the work will depend.

Comrades know that the plan for 1984 was not easy to form. It is balanced with a certain strain. This has been influenced, of course, to a considerable extent by the known defects [nedorabotki] in the national economy and by the quality of planning itself. But whatever the reasons given as explanation, we are bound to ensure a successful implementation of the plan, and the paramount condition for that is efficient organization of the entire work both in the center and locally.

It is obvious that already at the first stage, in each sector and in each work collective, one should have a clear idea of by what ways, through what means and methods the high targets inherent in the draft plan will be

implemented to economize all types of resources, materials, feedstock, and energy, to raise labor productivity and boost the manufacture of consumer goods.

It is essential to thoroughly consider all this again and again, and during the implementation of the plan constantly and persistently to look for additional reserves to ensure an uninterrupted functioning of the national economy.

The task can be set in a party manner only thus: It is necessary to ensure the implementation of the plan without fail, but in so doing to use every opportunity for exceeding it. This must be the aim of the entire economic activity, socialist emulation, economic, organizational, ideological and educational work of the party, trade union, and Komsomol bodies, and local soviets. The most important thing after a plan is worked out, as Lenin said, is to be able to arouse both competition and initiative among the masses, so that they set about the job straightaway" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 52, p 39).

I would like to note that a number of documents have been adopted recently with a view to further developing the initiative of working people. These are, first of all, the law on work collectives and resolutions on the tightening of discipline, on the development of the team form of the organization of labor, etc.

The ability of economic leaders and public organizations to enlist people's efforts and to achieve high ultimate results of work should be judged from how the party decisions will be translated into practical deeds at every enterprise and amalgamation.

When discussing the draft plan, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee supported a proposal to set a concrete task to the party, trade union organizations, and work collectives--to achieve an above-plan growth of labor productivity, say of 1 percent and to cut down the production cost of output additionally by 0.5 percent. This would be regarded as the party's additional assignment to the plan.

Comrades V. V. Grishin, D. A. Kunayev, V. V. Scherbitskiy, V. I. Vorotnikov, and E. A. Shevardnadze reported that the foremost collectives of Moscow and Leningrad, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Georgia, and of other cities are ready to come forward as initiators of such a movement.

This deserves the most ardent approval. The elaboration and adoption of obligations should be organized on this basis everywhere, special economy accounts should be opened for enterprises, construction projects, state farms, and all organizations, and those who will achieve the best results should be actively encouraged.

Other diverse forms of the people's initiative may also become a good additional contribution to the implementation of the plan of 1984 and of the five-year period as a whole.

A movement for raising the shift index of equipment was widely developed in the country at one time, for example. Subsequently it began to fade out unjustifiably. Herein are vast reserves of growth of both the efficiency of production and labor productivity.

Really, what picture can be observed now? Take the country's biggest Kharkov tractor works. In 1980-1982 the machine-tool fleet at the enterprise grew by 9 percent while its shift index went down from 1.5 to 1.41. This is explained by the lack of labor resources while demands for more and more equipment are voiced with enviable persistence and with no particular concern for how it will be used.

But there are different examples, too. A compulsory procedure to certify whether workplaces correspond to the rules of scientific organization of labor has been introduced at the Dnepropetrovsk Harvester-Manufacturing Factory which is, incidentally, subordinated to the same Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machinery Building. As a result, within 3 years, with an increase in output, about 600 workplaces were cut down or, in other words, considerable labor resources have been found at the factory without any special capital outlays.

There is no doubt that combined with an energetic effort to automate production it is this approach that makes it possible to tap tremendous reserves of the growth of labor productivity.

Regrettably, over recent years the movement for the speediest achievement of the designed labor input per unit of output has been practically forgotten. It ought to be said bluntly that proper concern for reducing labor inputs is not yet shown in a number of sectors. If one remembers prewar years, though, there was a vigorous drive under way then to expedite the achievement of the designed labor inputs.

We ought to revive also the movement for increasing the shift index of machinery and achieving the planned labor inputs per unit of output. And, of course, to do this on a new organizational and technical basis. There is hardly needed any proof that this will make it possible to boost output substantially, while slashing production costs. The ministries and departments as well as the planning agencies should seriously ponder how to carry out the related measures.

The next question. The resolution of the Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the fulfillment of contractual obligations for the supplies of products has much significance in the system of measures to tighten discipline. All indications are that this measure has somewhat improved the situation in the national economy. But facts also indicate that this fundamental problem has not yet been resolved fully.

The responsibility of the economic executives for fulfilling contracts and orders has been raised. This is true. But there still are "loopholes" allowing the payment of bonuses where the supply quotas have not been met in full. The planning agencies have even legalized a special term: "The

maximum percentage of underfulfillment." True, the instruction makes the reservation that this indicator of lack of discipline--there is hardly any other way of calling it--should be limited to 1 or 2 percent and only in exceptional cases to 3 percent.

But if it is allowed in principle to violate contracts, some executives use this "right" to the full. Say, a number of engineering ministries this year have applied the maximum limit of underfulfillment of contractual obligations to nearly half of their factories.

Quite understandably, the discipline of supplies depends not only on the factories but also on the material and technology supply agencies, transport, all those managerial links that are called upon to ensure that the production process goes on without interruptions and maintains a steady rhythm. And everyone involved in this process should, in the event of contractual obligations not being honored, answer for this to the extent of his guilt.

The USSR Council of Ministers should examine these issues, work out corresponding proposals, and enforce proper order.

There is also another problem that deserves most careful attention. Our planning agencies, ministries and departments have not yet come up with the necessary solutions to ensure that the production, scientific and technological potential available in the country be used fully and most efficiently.

Let us take, for example, the huge capacities that have been created in the chemical and petrochemical industries as well as in engineering over recent years. Many of them have not been used in full for a long time because of intrasectorial and intersectorial lack of coordination and disproportions.

It appears expedient that each ministry, the USSR State Planning Committee and the USSR State Material and Technological Supply Committee should work out as soon as possible special measures to eliminate the bottlenecks and disparities that reduce the efficiency of utilizing the production potential.

And, of course, we are duty-bound to work constantly and persistently to accelerate scientific and technological progress. Many industries are now advancing faster and more confidently in this direction. The new decisions taken after the November Plenum and the important experiments staged to stimulate the development and introduction of new technology have given an appreciable impetus to this headway.

But the organization of the entire package of scientific and technological work is far from being efficient. Some industries are marking time and failing to fulfill plans to introduce new equipment, the scope of these plans themselves leaving much to be desired. The state of affairs in the national economy demands a decisive turn by the ministries, departments, and the USSR Academy of Sciences toward raising the technical standards of production and improving the quality of products.

Much will depend on how we shall be able to mobilize the staffs of factories, scientific research and design organizations, engineers, technicians and scientists for intensifying scientific and technological progress. This is a task of priority importance. We must and can accomplish it.

Every year, when discussing social and economic development plans, we are compelled to dwell upon the problem of capital construction. This can be understood. The scale of capital construction in the country is vast. There is a direct link between capital construction and the fulfillment of our plans to increase industrial production, consolidate the material and technological foundation of agriculture, and improve the living conditions of the working people and the cultural and daily life amenities available to them.

Regrettably, the state of affairs in this most important sector still cannot satisfy us. A number of facilities and projects are not commissioned on schedule.

The heads of building organizations often enter lengthy explanations of their work failures and look for objective causes behind them. What is needed, however, are not explanations but real improvements in the state of things in construction. Tremendous public funds have been invested in this sector, there has been created a well-developed industrial base, there are competent design organizations, and the building sites are now better stocked with machinery.

The key to success there, just as, incidentally, elsewhere, is in raising the responsibility of the personnel and strictly demanding from them an irreproachable execution on their duties, efficiency, initiative and unconditional fulfillment of the set tasks. It is from this standpoint that we should appraise the work of our building ministries and their collegiums and territorial agencies, and the performance of the managerial staff. Particular exactingness should be displayed in supervising the fulfillment of plans to build housing, schools, hospitals, child-care preschool establishments, communal facilities, and everyday services establishments.

Transport operations demand the unremitting attention of the economic, party and soviet bodies. Of course, there have appeared positive trends there of late. But in transport there are perhaps more reserves and latent opportunities that can be opened up and tapped within a short period of time than anywhere else.

This refers first of all to reducing the irrational carriage of goods. We apparently need to make a thorough study of this question and work out essential measures to achieve proper order in the deployment, specialization and integration of production and to exclude the many unnecessary cross hauls that are burdensome to the economy as a whole.

This present-day scale and pace of development of productive forces demand changes in the attitude to questions connected with environmental protection and the rational use of nature resources. This is a task of major economic and social importance. For what is at issue in effect is protecting the health of the people and taking a careful, thrifty approach to the country's national wealth. Moreover, there are also questions of the future. Their resolution will determine the conditions in which the succeeding generations will live.

It must be stressed that despite the serious efforts being made by us, this problem on the order of the day remains acute.

This indicates that work for the protection of nature requires even more persistent and purposeful efforts. A narrow departmental approach is intolerable in this field, perhaps, more than in any other field, as it sharply lowers the effectiveness of the use of capital investments, hampers the pursuance of a single policy in carrying out nature protection measures, engenders irresponsibility for the ecological consequences of the decisions taken, is conducive to illusory economy, which, in the final analysis, results in great losses. In a word it is necessary to show a comprehensive approach to this problem from the nationwide positions, resolutely improve the whole system of environmental management and control.

Comrades, all of our efforts in the economy are aimed in the final analysis at ensuring a rise in the living standards of the people. This is the main sociopolitical objective of our plans. Any successes in the development of production are appraised at their true worth when they result in an improvement in the living standards of the people.

Quite a lot is being done in this respect in our country. The real income of the population is steadily on the rise, the construction of housing, culture and everyday service facilities is done on a large scale, education, health protection and culture are successfully developing. The plan for 1984 provides for a further rise in the living standards.

As before, the implementation of the Food Program requires much attention. The measures carried out this year have made it possible to improve somewhat the supply of the population with a number of foodstuffs. For the first time noticeable progress has been made recently in such an important field as livestock production. Purchases of milk, meat and eggs have increased. The feed base has strengthened. This gives hope for a further change for the better next year, too. To this end it is necessary that the Central Committees of the Communist Parties and the Council of Ministers of the union republics, the local party, soviet and economic bodies, the workers of the countryside ensure a successful wintering of cattle, a successful carrying out of spring sowing, in a word, make another step toward increasing the output of farming and livestock production.

It is the paramount duty of the party and soviet bodies of the republics, territories, regions, ministries and departments to increase persistently the use of the potential created in agriculture, the returns from the resources channelled to the development of the agroindustrial complex for resolving in full the problem of the supply of the population with foodstuffs.

One of the urgent tasks remains to satiate the market with the necessary manufactured goods. Under the conditions of a growth of the purchasing power of the population and the level of the supply of people with various commodities, the demands made on the assortment and quality of products have considerably increased recently. Yet industry is extremely slow in readjusting itself to the manufacture of modern consumer goods.

At the wholesale fair of recreational and household goods intended for sale in 1984, trade organizations refused to purchase 500,000 TV sets, 115,000 radio sets, almost 250,000 photographic cameras, 1.5 million watches and clocks, 160,000 domestic refrigerators and a number of other products because of the disparity between the quality and assortment of these goods and the demands made by the buyers.

It is intolerable that with a shortage of many products on sale, high-quality raw and primary materials are wasted on the manufacture of products, which are unmarketable, will then be stored in warehouses and their prices will inevitably be marked down.

There are also facts when because of a lack of efficiency on the part of officials in trade and industry, lack of knowledge of the real demand of the population, of the situation in the market, some products alternately become scarce, or accumulate on store counters and at factories. This entails not only a restructuring of production and losses, but also discontent among the population.

The incomplete satisfaction of the demand of the population for goods is a source of negative phenomena, including profiteering. It goes without saying that it is necessary further resolutely to combat this disgusting phenomenon using all means which the state has at its disposal. Yet the main point is that it is necessary to increase output, improve the quality of goods constantly, intensively develop the sphere of services, so as to eliminate fully the shortage of both goods and services. This should be made the personal responsibility of executives of every rank both in the center and in the provinces. The time has apparently come not just to talk about shortages in the production of goods for the people, but about specific officials standing behind these shortages. The party, soviet, and economic bodies shall keep this most important problem under their constant control.

As is known, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee has found it necessary to draw up, within the five-year plan for 1986-1990 and the guidelines for the long-term economic and social development of the USSR, a comprehensive program for the development of the production of consumer goods and the system of services for the population encompassing the most important aspects of the life of the Soviet people.

We, certainly, should not wait until this work is completed, and must resolve the pressing problems without delay, step by step.

In outlining the current objectives, we must not overlook the strategic problems in the development of the economy.

We will have to intensify considerably work to perfect economic management and further enhance the initiative of work collectives.

We attach much significance to carrying out at a number of ministries an economic experiment for widening the rights of enterprises and increasing their responsibility for the results of work. In the course of the experiment some new elements of management will be tested. Their results will serve as a basis for preparing relevant proposals for the economy as a whole.

It is necessary to prepare for that in advance in other branches too. We should enter the 12th Five-Year Plan period with a well-adjusted economic machinery allowing for an even fuller use of the potentialities of our economy.

I must say that quite a lot has been done recently to improve the quality of the state plans.

Still, our planning mechanism has many weak spots. Some cardinal tasks of economic development often seem to be adapted to the actual conditions in individual regions and branches. We should consistently abandon this, so to say, passive approach in planning.

The selection of the most effective directions in the development of the national economy, of the chief elements which make it possible to swiftly advance the country's economy along the path of intensification, is one of the most pressing tasks of perfecting planning and management.

In this connection, I would like to share some thoughts.

Concrete forms of management and planning must correspond to the real conditions of each state in the country's social development. This is an objective regularity which, quite obviously, no one can either change or cancel. That is why the improvement of the management system, based on the principles of democratic centralism, is an integral part of the overall process of perfecting our social system.

The issue of working out a program of all-round perfection of the entire mechanism of management has become ripe. This mechanism should fully correspond to the economy of developed socialism and to the character of the tasks that are being handled.

I think that this program should provide for:

Perfection of the organizational structure of management at all levels and in all sectors of the national economy, including a clear definition of the functions, rights and responsibility of management bodies and of enterprises, organic combination of the interests of the state and of work collectives;

Improvement of the planning system in the national economy proceeding from the demands for higher socioeconomic effectiveness of social production;

Higher effectiveness of economic levers and stimuli of the economic mechanism in their entirety, including price formation, credit-financial system, methods of evaluating the results of economic activity, etc.

Only an all-round and comprehensive study of the issues of improving the management system may resolve the tasks of the fullest use of the advantages intrinsic in the socialist method of production. This should become an important integral part of the new edition of the CPSU Program.

These are some issues which I thought it necessary to dwell upon. Of course, they do not exhaust the range of economic problems that demand solution, the more so, as life constantly advances new ones.

Our successes will depend to a decisive extent on the mobilization of the masses, on the people's creative attitude to work assigned to them, on further development of socialist emulation.

Of major importance is the thorough selection of cadres according to their business and political qualities, education of true organizers of production, resourceful, able workers. The attitude of good will to them, which has been established, must be combined to a still greater degree with high exactingness and principledness.

All these are the immediate tasks of party work.

A report and election campaign is currently drawing to an end in the party. The meetings and conferences, already held, demonstrated total support for the course of the 26th Party Congress, November and June plenums of the Central committee, orientation of all party organizations at resolute perfection of the style and methods of party guidance. We view this as a pledge of the successful solution of the new tasks of further advancing the national economy, of raising the well-being of the Soviet people.

Comrades, in conclusion, I would like to share with you thoughts about the lofty role and responsibility of the members of the CPSU Central Committee, of all the participants in the plenum of the Central Committee present in this hall to the party and to the people.

We roused the working people, aimed them at good work and simultaneously encouraged great expectations by the collectively elaborated decisions of the November Plenum. A great deal has been achieved, but much is still to be done.

Millions of communists and nonparty people infinitely trust the party and are prepared to support the measures for further improvement of the situation in the economy and in other spheres of social life. This places immense personal responsibility on all of us, on everyone without exception, and we should justify this profound confidence of the people.

No matter where members and candidate members of the Central Committee, members of the Central Auditing Commission might work--in the government, or sectors of the national economy, in party, Soviet bodies or in science, in the sphere of culture or in the diplomatic field--we all must always remember that we are political leaders and we must place highest the interests of the party and of the people.

The main thing today is setting the tone and showing a fitting personal example in work, doing everything for the development of the economy and social relations, for improving the life of the people, and being invariably guided in this activity by the lofty Leninist principles.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/7

ON THE DRAFT STATE PLAN FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE USSR
AND DRAFT STATE BUDGET OF THE USSR FOR 1984

PM272046 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 13 Jan 84)
pp 12-14

[Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum of 27 December 1983]

[Text] Thanks to the selfless work of the Soviet people in implementing the decisions of the 26th Party Congress, the CPSU Central Committee Plenum notes that our country is making confident headway along the road of economic and social progress. The policy of improving socialist economic management and of raising the level of organization, discipline, businesslike efficiency and responsibility of cadres, which is being consistently pursued in line with the directives of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is yielding positive results. The rates of economic development have risen. Qualitative indicators have improved somewhat. Production of industrial and agricultural items has increased. Railway transport has begun to function more steadily. The real income of the population has risen.

At the same time, there are still bottlenecks and significant shortcomings in many sectors of the national economy. A large amount of work remains to be done in order to eliminate them.

It is important to maintain the pace that has been set and the general mood of practically tackling tasks, to steadily raise the level of party and state leadership of the economy and to develop more actively the positive tendencies of growth in efficiency, making them more stable in nature.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum has decided the following:

1. To approve totally and entirely the activities of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo for implementing the domestic and foreign policies devised by the 26th Party Congress and the November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum unanimously approves and supports the in-depth assessments and conclusions on the main directions for further developing the national economy as contained in the speech by Comrade Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and regards this speech as a very important political document, vividly expressing the socioeconomic policies of the party and soviet state at the present stage.

The plenum considers that the tackling of the urgent, current and long-term economic tasks put forward by Comrade Andropov should be the basis of activity for the entire party, for all soviet and economic bodies, and for public organizations and labor collectives. This should be a very important obligation for every communist.

2. To approve in the main the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the draft State Budget of the USSR for 1984.

The draft plan and draft budget correspond with the party's economic strategy and map out the further dynamic development and raising of the efficiency of social production and the growth of the well-being of the people; they provide for everything necessary to maintain the country's defense capability at the proper level.

The USSR Council of Ministers shall submit the drafts referred to for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

3. To have the Central Committees of the union republics, the kray committees, oblast committees, okrug committees, city committees, and rayon committees of the party; the primary party organizations; the ministries and departments, the soviet, economic, trade union, and Komsomol organs develop on a wide scale organizational and mass-political work in the mobilization of the work collectives and of all the working people for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plan tasks of 1984.

They are to ensure further growth of the efficiency of the economy and to place the main emphasis on raising the level of economic management, speeding up scientific and technical progress, and using more fully production potential and all material, labor and financial resources; to seek out additional reserves persistently; to achieve above-plan growth in labor productivity and reduction of prime cost of output; to increase profit; to improve product quality; and to observe strictly contractual obligations.

Priority must be given to intensifying the effort to make economies. Ministries and departments, every enterprise, construction site, and farm should develop and implement concrete measures for reducing labor costs, expenditure of raw and other materials, and of fuel and energy resources.

An important task is the implementation of the USSR Energy Program.

Taking into consideration the growing volume of capital construction, particular attention should be paid to improving the organization of construction work, concentrating forces and resources at precommissioning projects, and to ensuring that new production capacities are put into operation and assimilated in the shortest possible time.

Workers in the agroindustrial complex should constantly increase their efforts to implement the USSR Food Program and increase the yield of fields and the productivity of livestock farming. The resources being channeled toward the development of agriculture should be utilized with greater efficiency.

On the basis of the further development of the economy and the achievement of high technical-economic indexes, the realization of the social program for the 11th Five-Year Plan period should be continued consistently. Persistent efforts should be made to increase the output, improve the quality, and extend the range of consumer goods; and to develop the network of consumer service enterprises and improve their work. The implementation of set tasks in the development of health care, education, and culture, and in the handing over of housing, preschool establishments, schools, hospitals, and professional-technical schools should be ensured.

It should be considered necessary to give all these questions due prominence at the forthcoming report and election party conferences in krais and oblasts, and in all the work connected with preparations for the USSR Supreme Soviet elections.

4. The CPSU Central Committee Plenum stresses that in solving current tasks attention to the strategic problems of developing the national economy should not be allowed to wane.

It is necessary actively to improve the system of planning and management of the economy, and the style and methods of socialist management. Party, soviet, and economic bodies must do everything necessary for the successful implementation of the economic experiment being conducted in a number of sectors for extending the rights and increasing the independence and accountability of associations and enterprises with regard to the results of work.

With a view to more efficient utilization of the created production capacities, it should be considered expedient that the USSR State Planning Committee, ministries and departments, the Councils of Ministers of the union republics develop special measures aimed at eliminating intersectorial and intrasectorial and determine clearly the ways and means for their implementation.

Still more scope must be given to the work of introducing exemplary order and organization in production at all sectors of economic and cultural construction, and there must be an active struggle to strengthen state, plan, and labor discipline.

5. The CPSU Central Committee calls upon workers, kolkhoz farmers, engineering and technical workers, intelligentsia, all working people of our country, to mount a broad socialist competition for fulfillment and overfulfillment of the 1984 plan and tasks of the five-year plan period as a whole, in achieving high production results. In conditions of an international situation that has sharply deteriorated through the fault of imperialist circles, strict fulfillment of the plan tasks, conscientious, high-productivity labor is not only the obligation but the patriotic duty of each working collective and each Soviet person.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum expresses the firm conviction that Soviet people, closely rallying around the Leninist Party, will tirelessly strengthen the economic and defense might of our homeland, will give all their strength for the achievement of fresh successes in communist construction.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

SOME QUESTIONS OF THE WORK OF THE SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES AT THE
CONTEMPORARY STAGE

AU281530 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84)
pp 15-28

[Article by V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee
Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] The soviets of people's deputies are the basis of the people's political power in socialism. Above all, it is through soviets--the unified and genuinely representative system of stage organs--that the idea of democracy, as the power of the people in the interest of the people, is being realized in our country. And now, during the election campaign that has developed throughout the country in connection with the USSR Supreme Soviet elections, the historical advantages of socialist democracy are being revealed especially comprehensively and conspicuously.

Working people's meetings are held everywhere and they very convincingly attest to the monolithic cohesion of the Soviet people around the communist party and to their increased determination to defend peace and spare no efforts to strengthen the country's economic and defense might.

The results of what has been accomplished are being summed up and a special kind of an all-people's review of activities of the soviets of people's deputies and of all state organs is in progress. The work of the soviets and their ability to truly express the interests and aspirations of the working people, to know well the attitudes, demands, and needs of the people, and to consistently obtain the practical satisfaction of these demands and needs, are being comprehensively evaluated. Precisely herein lie the sources of the high authority of the soviets and of their close ties with workers in cities and villages, of the further development of the masses' living creativity, and of an increasingly complete inclusion of all strata of people in the decisionmaking process and the administration of state and public affairs.

Our party is going to the elections with a scientifically founded political platform that is understandable and near to all Soviet people. The decisions of the 26th Party Congress and of the November 1982 and June and December 1983 plenums of the CPSU Central Committee express this platform in a concentrated manner. These decisions aim at transforming the national economy into a highly effective and smoothly running mechanism, at accelerating scientific-technical progress, at strengthening organization and order in all spheres of

state and social life, and at improving ideological and political-education work, represent a united political line and essentially define the strategy of perfecting developed socialism at the contemporary stage of the country's life.

I

CPSU economic and social policy, expressing the fundamental interests of the people, is concretely embodied in state plans of the country's economic and social development. Full utilization of the possibilities the plan provides for places powerful levers in the hands of the soviets for purposefully solving the tasks set for them, ensuring complex development of their respective regions and improving the state of affairs in all directions.

Thanks to the Soviet people's selfless work in implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, our country is confidently advancing on the road of economic and social progress.

At the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, it was noted in the text of the address by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee--this most important political document--that the policy of perfecting socialist economy and raising the level of organization and discipline and the efficiency and responsibility of cadres is producing positive results. The rate of economic growth has accelerated, the quality indexes have improved somewhat, the production of industrial and agricultural products has increased, the operations of railroad transportation have become more stable, and the real income of the people has increased.

However, the results achieved provide no ground for complacency. Substantial shortcomings still exist in many sections of the national economy and much work must be done to eliminate them. It is important to preserve the gathered speed and the general inclination to practically fulfill the tasks, to steadfastly continue raising the level of party and state leadership in the economy, to more actively develop the positive tendencies toward increased efficiency, and to give these tendencies a stable character.

The ninth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 10th convocation ratified the State Plan of Economic and Social Development and the USSR State Budget for 1984 and adopted them as laws. The December Plenum and, subsequently, the session of the highest organ of authority unanimously approved and ardently supported the profound assessments of and conclusions on the basic directions of the national economy's further development incorporated in the address by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov. The 1984 plan and budget, which accord with the party's economic strategy, map out further dynamic development and increase of the efficiency of social production and growth of the well-being of people and envisage everything necessary to maintain the country's defense capability at the proper level.

The contemporary strategy of social development worked out by the party coordinates the politics, economy, social practice, and spiritual development of the society and insists on further raising the role of representative organs

in fulfilling the main economic-organizational function of the socialist state. Improvement of the leadership of soviets in state, economic, and social-cultural construction, intensification of their practical influence, and consolidation of the legal foundations of developed socialism are also envisaged. Without diminishing their attention in relations and sectors of their work, the soviets are called upon to strive to attain real and practical changes in all directions in accordance with the aims set by our party.

The CPSU points out the need to activate the entire rich potential inherent in the Soviet system and to more fully and widely utilize the democratic forms and methods of work of the organs of state authority as well as of their ties with the masses. What is primarily involved in this connection are a businesslike and creative approach to fulfilling the country's socio-economic development tasks; an increased organizational and educational influence of soviets' sessions, meetings of their executive committees and standing commissions, and work of deputies in all spheres of state and society life; reflect practical needs and are designed to promote real improvement of the state of affairs and to eliminate shortcomings. This then is the basis for further strengthening the confidence of the broad masses of the working people in the organs of people's authority.

In the soviets' activity, everything is essential and important. There are no small or secondary questions in this activity. Therefore, the complex approach to solving the pertinent problems and the ability to find optimal solutions and permit no departmental narrow-mindedness or order of precedence in this connection, assume extraordinarily great importance.

At present, taking advantage of the upsurge in the Soviet people's political and work activities spurred by the forthcoming elections, the soviets see as one of their main tasks to intensify the real and active participation of the largest possible number of city and village workers in production management and in the organization of control of the amount of work and consumption and of the work of state and economic organs and officials. The enthusiasm, energy, and creativity of millions of people must be united into a single stream and skillfully directed to fulfilling the concrete tasks of economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual development of the Soviet society.

II

In light of the aims set by the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the most important direction of work of the soviets continues to be toward ensuring the complex economic and social development of their respective territories. Many soviets successfully coordinate branch and territorial interests and combine the possibilities and resources of enterprises subordinated at different levels for the sake of the general state interests and the needs of cities and rayons and their population. Experience of this kind has been accumulated in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tbilisi, Tallinn, and Krasnoyarskiy Kray. All union republics and all major regions of the country have their own beacons. This fully accords with the tasks incorporated in the well-known resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers on further raising the role of the soviets of people's deputies in economic construction.

However, it must be admitted that, although we are moving in the right direction, we are still moving much more slowly than we could and should. Many soviets and their executive organs still do not show the necessary activity and persistence in fulfilling their economic responsibilities and in ensuring the complex development of their respective territories.

It will be necessary to make thorough efforts to perfect the relations between the central organs of administration and the local organs of authority. It is no secret that some ministries and departments at times fail to consider the views of local soviets in solving problems that directly concern their interests. Enterprises subordinated at union and republican levels clearly participate in the development of individual regions insufficiently and disproportionally to what they could do and they do it with the approval of ministries. Devoting their primary attention to increasing production capacities, they underrate the needs for housing construction and the construction of social-cultural and everyday service projects. As a result of this, new production plants are often idle or are not fully utilized because of shortages of cadres.

This should not be so, just as no local precedence of interests should be imposed by individual soviets. It is important to find correct and reasonable proportions, to consistently incorporate them in branch and territorial planning, and conduct affairs in such a way that central and local organs will not substitute for one another, that they will act within the strictly defined framework, and ensure strict consideration for general state interests and the progressive planned development of the entire national economy.

Implementation of the energy program represents an important direction of work. The year that has just ended was marked by the fulfillment of relevant planned tasks. More than 1.4 trillion kwh of electric power were produced. The output of electric power was increased considerably compared with the 2 preceding years of the five-year plan period.

This fact is realistically reflected in the electric power supply for consumers. Definite changes for the better also took place in fuel economizing.

It is the soviets' duty to make important contributions to economizing energy resources. The introduction of necessary order in the energy consumption in enterprises and organizations as well as in local industries and housing and communal services, which consume more than 20 percent of the country's fuel and energy resources, depend on them to a great extent.

Fulfillment of the Food Program is a major issue which requires the constant concern of the soviets. Practice has shown that reorganization of agricultural production management creates conditions for further expanding the soviets' role in guiding the agroindustrial complex, provides a strong impulse to social reconstruction of the village, and enables new management organs to more actively and--what is most important--more purposefully direct the work of kolkhozes and sovkhoses serving their enterprises and organizations, and to achieve good results. A certain amount of leadership experience in the agroindustrial complex under new conditions has already been

accumulated in a number of oblasts and krays in the RSFSR, Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and in rayons of the Georgian, Moldavian, Latvian, Tadzhik, Turkmen, and Estonian SSRs.

It is very important that rayon agroindustrial associations receive more active support from the rural and settlement soviets, arrange businesslike contacts with them, and through joint efforts strive to increase product output in all categories of farms.

The work of Belorussian SSR soviets for implementing the Food Program was comprehensively analyzed at a meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Noting certain positive changes in the activity of soviets in this republic, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium called attention to the fact that in a number of places the real leadership practice in agriculture is changing slowly. Some leaders still adhere to old management methods that do not correspond to contemporary demands. The conclusions drawn apply to all soviets and can serve as a reference point for improving matters, taking into account, of course, the particular features of each republic.

The need to persistently improve utilization of the potential created in agriculture and the yield of resources aimed at developing the agroindustrial complex was pointed out at the December CPSU Central Committee Plenum as being the prime obligation of party and soviet organs in the republics, krays, and oblasts, and also of the ministries and departments.

Among the immediate tasks set by the party is to increase production and improve the quality of consumer goods, and expand the volume and variety of services offered to the population.

The supply level of many goods still lags behind the Soviet people's needs. In accordance with the CPSU Central Committee decision, a complex program for developing the production of consumer goods and the system of services for the population is being worked out for the 1986-2000 period.

As they have extensive possibilities and rights at their disposal, the soviets can make a worthy contribution both to working out the complex program and implementing it. They should already be developing practical work to increase the production of high quality goods for the people.

As practice shows, consolidated plans for producing these goods by all enterprises in their territories, irrespective of the department they are under, are an effective instrument in the hands of the soviets. It is necessary to study consolidated plans more soundly and thoroughly, and to aim at making them intensive and at the same time realistic and based wholly on available opportunities and resources. In this respect, particular attention must be devoted to producing necessary goods made from local raw materials and waste materials. Of course, constant and efficient control over implementing plans must play an important role.

In all the republics there are many examples where the soviets have shown initiative in the matter of increasing production, improving quality, and

expanding the assortment of consumer goods. The initiative of the Sverdlovsk inhabitants deserves support, as they have produced varied consumer goods at heavy industry enterprises.

But there are also examples of another kind. In a number of republics many enterprises that are subordinate to unions and republics do not participate in producing consumer goods. Some ministries and departments give tasks to their enterprises that are too simple, and do not utilize real possibilities to produce goods in high demand. At the meeting at the end of last year of the permanent commissions for consumer goods and trade of USSR Supreme Soviet councils, the deputies spoke with concern about the lack of responsibility of the leaders of a number of our industry's subdivisions. Workshops producing these products frequently find themselves in the position of stepchildren, have poor technical equipment, and lack the necessary designing and technological services.

The soviets also fully share the responsibility for this neglect. A considerable number of local power organs still do not show the necessary initiative and efficiency, frequently are under the thumb of economic organs, and resolutions instead of real, organizational work are produced while virtually no progress is made in work.

The soviets pay daily attention to the fact that the quality of everyday repairs and other services for the population needs to be further improved. The scope of services has noticeably grown recently and the range of services has expanded, and in this respect the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers has helped in many ways. Enterprises for everyday repairs and other services in Estonia have deservedly become well known in connection with quality and standard of work. The experience of leading collectives in Kiev, Leningrad, Penza, and some other cities and rayons is becoming more and more firmly established, since they have gone over to working under the system of "today means today." The essence of this system lies in the fact that, as a rule, orders for the repair of complex domestic equipment are fulfilled the same day as they are made, and, what is more, at a time convenient for the population.

The location of domestic servicing enterprises is of great importance. In Ufa, for example, rationally resolving the problem makes it possible for working people to save a considerable amount of time in obtaining services. However, in most large industrial centers, complaints are still common that inhabitants are compelled to transport refrigerators, washing machines, televisions, and other things over large distances--often right across the whole town--to have them repaired, because the location of domestic servicing enterprises was not properly thought out. The network of complex reception centers for domestic servicing is developing slowly in many cities. Everyday repairs and other services for the rural population are not in step with needs in a number of rayons.

Housing construction, organization of public health care, trade, and transport services must be constantly kept within the scope of the soviets' attention.

It is up to the soviets to give new impetus to a nationwide movement for economy and thrift. These problems are not all that simple. But practice shows that they can be resolved wherever the soviets approach the matter with interest, initiative, and with an economical manager's approach, as befits organs of power.

III

Today the national economy has large reserves at its disposal. Their mobilization is linked primarily with speeding up scientific-technical progress and broadly and rapidly introducing the achievements of science, technology, and advanced experience into production. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "on measures for accelerating scientific-technical progress in the national economy," is a step in this direction at this stage. Further growth in the scale of introducing scientific and technological achievements into production is envisaged in accordance with the state plan for the country's economic and social development for 1984.

Many soviets of people's deputies successfully aid in drafting and implementing scientific-technical programs. For instance, good results were achieved in Ivanovo Oblast during the implementation of a complex program of reconstructing, modernizing, and technically reequipping textile and light industry enterprises. Useful experience is to be found in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Azerbaijan, the Krasnoyarsk Kray, and the Novosibirsk, Tomsk, and other oblasts. The task consists of conducting work in this direction everywhere.

Activation of scientific-technical progress is opening up good prospects for substantially resolving problems of increasing labor productivity.

In the text of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's speech at the December CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the concrete task is set out of "increasing labor productivity over and above the plan--let us say by 1 percent--and of additionally reducing the prime production cost by 0.5 percent." The country's working people fervently approve this proposal, consider it a party instruction of exceptional importance and an additional task to the plan, and are taking on new and increased obligations everywhere.

The organs of power and the people's deputies can do a great deal toward increasing labor productivity and reducing prime production costs. This involves perfecting the economic mechanism at all levels. It involves comprehensive support for an wide dissemination of everything new and progressive, and the personal example of producer deputies, who comprise two-thirds of the total number of deputies. Finally, it involves the fullest possible use of opportunities for socialist competition to mobilize the working people, timely and commensurate encouragement to leading workers, production innovators, and shock workers of the 11th Five-Year Plan, and the skillful use of moral and material stimulation and various forms of manifestation of people's initiative.

Acceleration of scientific-technical progress is indissolubly linked with the need to decisively improve protection of the environment. Life itself binds these problems into a tight knot and makes them virtually indivisible.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov defines environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources as a task of great economic and social significance. Basically, the question is one of people's health and of a thrifty and economical approach to the country's national wealth, he notes. More than that, these are also problems of the future. The conditions in which future generations will live depend upon their being resolved.

Many republics devote ever greater attention to preserving natural resources. For example, last year the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of the Uzbek SSR, Kazakh SSR and Armenian SSR thoroughly discussed problems of nature protection.

Nevertheless, many instances may be cited of the pernicious and often irrevocable consequences of enterprises' economic activity that sometimes flagrantly breaks elementary norms of environmental protection and legislative requirements.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium recently considered the implementation of laws on the protection of nature at nonferrous metallurgy enterprises. It turned out that in some cities--in particular Norilsk, Ust-Kamenogorsk and others where this branch's enterprises are located--the emission of harmful substances into the atmosphere not only has not been reduced but has even increased. Plans to build purification installations are systematically thwarted, and available installations are poorly exploited. The ministry is now working out a complex of measures to eliminate the violations revealed.

The harmful waste materials situation at a number of other branches' enterprises is no better. In this connection the 1984 state plan has introduced new and stricter indicators of permissible waste dumping for enterprises of a series of ministries, at the recommendation of the commission for the protection of nature and the rational use of natural resources of the USSR Supreme Soviet councils. These indicators will make the system of measures for protection of nature more reliable and effective.

According to the instructions of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, environmental protection must be approached comprehensively and from general state positions, and the whole system of management and control over the environmental condition must be decisively improved.

In this connection, in the future the soviets will have to tighten control over the timely preparation and exploitation of purification and other necessary installations at every project, and to ensure that production plants which pollute the environment will not be put into operation unless environmental protection measures envisaged by the draft are implemented. Supervision should be increased so that legislation on environmental protection is absolutely adhered to and those who violate it are dealt with in the strictest manner.

Further activation of the nationwide struggle to increase organization, responsibility and discipline and ensure necessary order at every work place is still of key significance in fulfilling the tasks set by the party. This

policy, which was decisively adopted by the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is already yielding real results. Loss of work time due to absenteeism, idling and cadre turnover have been reduced to some extent, work time is being used more effectively and fully, and accuracy and production rhythm are improving. Of course, all this cannot help but affect economic indexes and labor productivity.

However, there are still many examples of insufficient attention being paid to strengthening discipline. Loss of work time at a number of industrial, construction, and transport enterprises due to absenteeism and other violations has not decreased but increased. The reason for this situation lies in the fact that persistent and painstaking work in educating the Soviet people in the spirit of conscious discipline, through understanding the need for a high level of organization, and firm order, which are the most important conditions for the normal functioning of Soviet society, is still not being conducted everywhere.

In some collectives the struggle for discipline seems to be superficial, is not being supplemented by timely measures to perfect production organization, improve everyday life, and increase responsibility in all sections, and is not being reinforced by everyday ideological-educational work.

The soviets and the people's deputies must struggle more resolutely against all these shortcomings and omissions. They must in every possible way assist the preparation and implementation of necessary measures to ensure that the process of strengthening discipline will assume an ever wider scope, affect production more profoundly, and penetrate all strata of social life.

Our Soviet laws are an effective means of strengthening order, ensuring stability of social relations, and molding the socialist personality. "...By promulgating laws that meet the aspirations and hopes of the broad popular masses, the new authority"--emphasized V. I. Lenin--"places landmarks along the path of development of new forms of life" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 56).

Since the adoption of the USSR Constitution by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium under the leadership of the party Central Committee, a great deal of work has been done to renew and develop legislation. Today the main spheres of the life of a developed socialist society are regulated in the legislative order. In the coming years a series of new legislative acts in the sphere of economic and cultural construction, scientific-technical progress, and consolidation of the legal status of individual rights must be worked out.

But the main emphasis today must be laid on practically carrying out the provisions incorporated in the laws. As is well known, even the most perfect law will not be effective and influence practice if it is not backed up by purposeful organization work. In this connection, attention should be paid to the importance of strict implementation of the recently passed law on labor collectives. Each of its provisions must be put into practice in the everyday work of state and economic organs, officials, and all the working people.

Intensifying control over the precise implementation of laws and struggling against violations of laws and criminality are some of the most important tasks we face today. Still very acute are problems concerning the prevention of law violations by minors, domestic crimes, crimes committed when drunk, and embezzlement.

Of course, the main responsibility in the struggle against these negative phenomena rests with policy organs, the courts, and the procurator's office. It is the most important part of their work, and they are answerable for it first and foremost. The soviets' task is to be stricter in calling to account the organs responsible for upholding the law and to persistently ensure that they perform their functions more effectively.

But the soviets' obligations do not amount only to this. Eradicating ugly phenomena alien to the socialist way of life is a state matter. Consequently, the organs of authority are called upon to draw the public into this work on a wider scale and to create a situation of real intolerance toward hooligans, drunkards, parasites, and plunderers of socialist property. Law enforcement organs must be helped in every possible way to find ways and means of perfecting all work connected with struggling against law-breaking and must consistently strive to change the state of affairs for the better.

It is very important to further strengthen the educational potential of the work of law enforcement agencies in every possible way, and to show tireless concern for the purity of their ranks and for the ideological conviction, political maturity, organization, discipline, and high professional and moral qualities among those who work for in the law courts, the procurator's office, and with the militia.

Of course, the Soviets themselves must be irreproachable concerning strict implementation of the law. Meanwhile, the soviets and their executive committees still quite frequently adopt decisions that contradict the laws, and sometimes there are even cases of Soviet legislation being directly violated. It is necessary to most decisively suppress the slightest lack of respect for the law on the part of the workers of the soviets, and to be tirelessly concerned about raising their political and legal standards.

The soviets must persistently seek means to further perfect the control activity of the permanent commissions called upon in contemporary conditions to actively and consistently expound on the complex approach to economic development and to strive to overcome departmentalism in work. The commissions' work on energy, agriculture, consumer goods, and trade, and other problems, the solution of which is at the center of party and state attention, deserves increased attention. Exacting criticism by the commissions, strict control over the fulfillment of recommendations they have worked out, and necessary aid in their implementation represent an essential contribution to implementation of the party socioeconomic policy.

The control activity of the supreme organ of the country's state authority is becoming broader and more diverse. In recent years, the reports of a number of USSR ministries, the USSR Committee of People's Control, the Procurator

General, the USSR Supreme Court, the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets and the Council of Ministers of the union republics, and the executive committees of the local soviets, have been examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. USSR government reports on implementation progress of the proposals from the permanent commissions and deputies are regularly discussed at Presidium meetings. This practice makes it possible to organize work better and ensure smooth running of the economic mechanism, and as a whole increases the efficiency of the soviets' activity and their role as transmitters of party policy among the masses.

In the sphere of control work, the soviets of people's deputies must make broader use of the resources of the organs of people's control, and establish everyday businesslike contact on the spot with trade union and Komsomol committees. Where this is done, a large range of enterprises and institutions can be checked, and the best results in eliminating shortcomings that slow down the fulfillment of laws, resolutions, and obligations can be achieved.

The soviets face major tasks in the light of the problem posed by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov of preparing a program for comprehensively perfecting the whole mechanism of management, which must fully accord with the economy of developed socialism and the nature of tasks that are being resolved today.

IV

The decisions of the November 1982, June and December 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums are a long-term and internally united program of important transformations called forth by the vital needs of the life of Soviet society. By its very essence this program is thoroughly innovative, and demands breadth and boldness of thinking and a decisive rejection of many longstanding stereotypes and notions.

In this connection, the task of comprehensively ideologically ensuring the transformations dictated by life has been set by the party as one of exceptional importance.

The soviets are called upon to fulfill a whole complex of ideological-educational and cultural-educational tasks within the course of large-scale work developed by the party for radically improving the ideological safeguarding of communist construction. The essence of these tasks lies in ensuring--while taking increased possibilities into account--that the working people have still more extensive and real access to the properties of socialist civilization, placing education, science and culture more fully at the service of the people, and giving every Soviet citizen still greater actual opportunities for comprehensive development and creativity.

By implementing party directives in the sphere of education and raising the level of culture, the soviets must strive so that people, as was emphasized at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, are brought up in our country not simply as holders of a certain sum of knowledge, but primarily as citizens of a socialist society and active builders of communism with the ideological aims, morals, interests, and high standard of work and conduct characteristic

of them. In this connection, the soviets must heighten the education effect of practical activity, and strive for unity in organizational and political-educational work at all levels and stages of leadership of state, economic, and sociocultural construction.

In the foreground is still the task of instilling in every member of society the organic need for conscientious and highly productive labor, the clear realization of the necessity of work for the general good, and a profound understanding of the fact that, under socialism, control over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption is determined by the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work." The soviets and the organs accountable to them are called upon to persistently strive for the authority of honest, conscientious work being confirmed everywhere, so that an interested and creative attitude toward the task in hand becomes characteristic of every worker in whatever section he may work.

This is especially important today. As the December Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee pointed out, in the conditions in which, by the fault of the imperialist circles, the international situation has sharply aggravated, a strict fulfillment of planned tasks and conscientious and highly productive work are not only an obligation but also a patriotic duty of every labor collective and every Soviet citizen.

The collective forms of work organization which have become widely spread in recent times favor the formation of a new man worthy of the society of developed socialism. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee "On Further Developing and Improving the Effectiveness of the Brigade Form of Organization and Stimulation of Work in Industry" convincingly demonstrates the growing role of brigades in accelerating the intensification of production and fulfilling the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and the subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee. The soviets must more effectively support the new forms of work organization and help them to assert themselves in all spheres of production.

In light of the directions of the party and especially the June 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the soviets must more effectively utilize their available possibilities to influence the spiritual development of the society and activate the arsenal of means of influencing the people's minds and hearts. What is primarily involved in this connection is a matter of seriously raising the work level of educational, cultural and sports institutions.

The 26th CPSU Congress called attention to the need to improve the quality of training and of work and moral education in schools, overcome formalism in evaluating the work of teachers and students, strengthen in practice the link between training and life, and improve the preparation of schoolchildren for socially useful work. The current practice shows that existing shortcomings are being eliminated only slowly.

The CPSU Central Committee commission has prepared the draft of "Basic Directions of the Reform of General Education and Professional Schools" published

for discussion by all people. In this connection it is very important to carefully consider all proposals and observations received, and to publicize everything valuable that the Soviets have accumulated in the administration of national education affairs. It is also necessary to comprehensively take into account the experience of the best pedagogical collectives which have followed the practice of effectively uniting training with productive work and ensuring harmonious development of the growing generation.

Great and constant attention must be devoted to cultural and sports institutions. The following facts attest to the real possibilities now available to the Soviets: In the entire USSR there are more than 138,000 active cultural clubs, halls, and palaces, more than 300,000 libraries, 150,000 movie theaters, more than 2,000 professional theaters and museums, about 350,000 stadiums and sports grounds, and 73,000 sports halls.

The June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee considered it advisable to spread the experience of forming, in all rayons, cultural and sports complexes which would be subordinated to local soviets irrespective of their departmental affiliation. In the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania, and in several oblasts of the Russian Federation, the work in this direction is progressing successfully at the rayon level, something that is creating conditions for a more efficient utilization of cadres and material-technical resources, significantly broadening the range of activities of cultural institutions and sports organizations, and making it possible to extend the scope of measures taken to all strata of the population.

Of course it would be premature to see everything in rosy colors. Advance experience still has not been introduced sufficiently widely and actively. In some places the reorganization has been carried out only formally. It does not lead to tangible changes in work, to improving conditions for spiritual and physical development of the working people and especially youth, or to raising the level of cultural services for the population.

Guided by the plenum's decision, the soviets must improve and raise the level of work of cultural and sports institutions, persistently strive to ensure that these institutions make a real contribution to socialist civilization, and tirelessly continue to strengthen reciprocal actions and cooperation in this sphere and with the trade union and Komsomol organizations.

It is exceptionally important to activate work at the citizens' residential areas and this work must be multifaceted. Citizens legitimately want communal services, trade network, and clinics to function well, they want well-built homes and roads, and so forth. As experience has shown, the population itself is ready to participate in solving this vitally important problem.

Party organizations in housing administrations and in villages, as well as territorial groups of deputies, must be at the center of this work.

It is precisely under their leadership that our entire community must organize itself and that the activities of housing committees, parents' committees, support centers for the protection of public order, and comrades'

courts--in short the activities of the soviets' entire aktiv, which now includes more than 30 million people--must be directed.

It is necessary to strive and ensure that the work of these organizations is effective and coordinated and that it will reach every family and every individual. The soviets must move on from occasional measures and meetings to systematic work in residential areas and reach all sections of the population in their residential quarters and dormitories. The leading workers of soviets must enhance their role in improving the dissemination of information among the population and in studying the attitudes, requirements, and everyday needs of people.

The great tasks entrusted to the soviets and the organs accountable to them require a certain reorganization of the work of the soviets' very apparatus. It is necessary to find ways and means to solve problems that appear and ensure in this connection that party directives will be consistently implemented.

In this connection, workers of the soviets and all deputies must fully realize that they have a major responsibility for implementing party policy in all sectors of the state, economic, and social-cultural construction. However difficult these problems may be, they must be solved more and more persistently and consistently with the support of party organs, on the basis of the valid laws, and proceeding from the interests of people. In light of the instruction of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, it is necessary even more to combine the established good will toward cadres with a high exactingness and principled attitude.

It is very important to refrain from waiting for "additional instructions" or "better times" when someone "at the top" will eliminate the existing obstacles or when, according to the opinion of some workers, the conditions will finally "be ripe" for the soviets to exercise their extensive authority. It is urgently necessary to strive without a single day's delay and begin to achieve concrete and real changes and improve the state of affairs in all sectors of work.

V

Preparations for the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee on this issue notes, are taking place at a time when, due to American imperialism, serious exacerbation of the international situation has developed.

Reactionary forces are making wild plans for world domination and are pushing mankind to the brink of nuclear catastrophe, the arms race is being heated up without restraint, and there is direct military interference in the affairs of other states and peoples. This reckless policy is apparent primarily in the aspiration of the United States and its NATO allies to break at any price the existing military equilibrium that represents the basis of international security, and in the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Other actions of the United States and the reactionary regimes and

governments cooperating with it, actions that challenge mankind, also attest to this policy: the bandit-like attack on Grenada and its unlawful occupation, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, the threat to the Republic of Cuba, the American and Israeli occupation of Lebanon, and the open support for the aggression of the Republic of South Africa against Angola and other African countries.

The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community have taken a group of constructive peace-loving initiatives in relation to virtually all "sensitive points" and the most acute problems of the contemporary international situation. The declaration condemning nuclear war and the resolutions on freezing nuclear weapons and on preventing nuclear weapons in outer space, adopted by the UN General Assembly at the initiative of the Soviet Union, have invoked wide support among the world public. Our country consistently strives to realize the proposal for concluding an agreement between the Warsaw Pact states and the north Atlantic alliance on mutually renouncing the use of military force and maintaining relations of peace, and to make all states follow the example of the Soviet Union in assuming the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The USSR's determination to stop the forces of militarism and prevent the world from slipping into a nuclear war has been fully convincingly demonstrated in the 28 September and 24 November 1983 statements of Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. These extraordinary important documents provide a profound and comprehensive analysis of the causes of the present aggravation of the international situation and confirm the Soviet Union's immutable policy of preserving and consolidating peace, curbing the arms race, and widening and deepening cooperation between states.

At its December session, the USSR Supreme Soviet fully and completely approved the statement of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov and wholly supported the steps and measures taken by the communist party and the Soviet government to strengthen the Soviet Union's defense capability and ensure the security of the Soviet people and their allies. The USSR Supreme Soviet instructed the government to continue to follow the course of safeguarding security, to continue also in the future to take steps which--taking developing circumstances into consideration--would lead to changing the international situation for the better, and to actively follow this line also at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. It was solemnly declared that the Soviet Union would not encroach upon the security of any country either in the West or East. It wants to live in peace and to consistently implement the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different sociopolitical systems.

The soviets of people's deputies at all levels, and the supreme organ of authority of our state also make their contribution to implementing the principled peace-loving foreign political course. International relations between the USSR Supreme Soviet and foreign representative organs are being consistently deepened and perfected. Suffice it to say that during the last 5 years alone, 55 parliamentary delegations from 48 countries have paid

official visits to the Soviet Union. During this period also, 57 of our delegations visited 53 states at the invitation of their parliaments. The relations of the commissions for foreign affairs of the councils of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the USSR Parliamentary Group are active. Relations along the line of twin towns, and other friendly contacts between our local organs of authority and corresponding organs in foreign countries have developed extensively. Approximately 130 kray, oblast, rayon soviets and cities in our country maintain relations of this kind with socialist countries alone.

The most important task of the soviets of the people's deputies is to consistently perfect and increase the effectiveness of international relations implemented by the organs of authority, and to advance Soviet foreign political initiatives among foreign parliamentary circles to the maximum.

Every direction of the work of the soviets demands a thoughtful approach, well-founded and well-considered decisions, and a taking into account of a multitude of factors.

But there is a general rule for improving work and increasing the efficiency of socialist democracy. Its essence lies in activating the main motivating force of socialism--the historic creativity of the masses--in further developing the initiative and energy of millions, and in creating the conditions necessary for communist construction to become to an ever greater degree--as Lenin dreamed--the personal business of the whole people.

The communist party is the leading force and the soul of the democratic process that penetrates the life of the Soviet all-people's state and its international policy. Party organizations strive to insure that the soviets and the other state organs consistently follow the course of the party in practice. This is done not by means of decrees or orders but, thanks to the high authority of communists, trust on the part of the masses and the model activity of party members themselves in the state organs. Actively supporting everything that is new and progressive in the work of the soviets, the party today directs the organs of people's authority so that they work more efficiently and purposefully, ensure the necessary level of leadership in all sections of state, economic, and sociocultural construction, increase exactingness toward the cadres for the irreproachable fulfillment of their obligations, for accuracy and initiative, and for the unconditional fulfillment of standing tasks, and more effective control.

The election campaign, which has broadly developed in our country, is opening up exceptionally rich opportunities for increasing the practical participation of every Soviet citizen in governing the country. At the same time, the campaign shows the whole world with great force that the Soviet people, utterly devoted to the cause of the October Revolution and the cause of the party, are fully resolved to implement the plans of the 26th CPSU Congress, and of the November 1982, June and December 1983 plenums of the CPSU Central Committee.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/7

THE TORCHBEARER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY ERA

AU261115 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84)
pp 29-38

[Text] The time in which we live is called various things. Some call it the atomic age, and others--the space age. It is rarely spoken of as the epoch of the flourishing of science and technology and the solving of the innermost secrets of nature. It is all these things. But if we are to proceed from the sum total of the basic trends and phenomena of social life, then our time is primarily the epoch of the victorious social revolution of the proletariat and, for that reason, the epoch of the triumph of Leninism, and of its growing influence on all aspects of human development.

The revolutionary ideas of V. I. Lenin and such a convincing practical implementation of them as the October Revolution, the founding of the world's first socialist state, the formation of the international communist movement, and its transformation into the most influential political factor of the contemporary period, the formation of the world system of socialism, and the liberation of hundreds of millions of people from the fetters of capitalism--all this has radically changed the social appearance of the planet.

Approximately a century ago, the great Russian writer and revolutionary democrat M. Y. Saltykov-Shchedrin spoke of the conscience of mankind in one of his strikingly forceful works, expressing the age-long aspirations of the popular masses in allegorical form. Calling on many thousands of people, this conscience could find its refuge only in the pure heart of a child. "A small child grows, and conscience also grows with it inside the child. A small child will become a big man, and it will have a big conscience inside him. Then all falsehood, perfidy, and violence will disappear...."

For millions of people on earth, the name of Lenin, his life, and activity have been and remain the personification of the very conscience of mankind, a bright ray of hope for deliverance from the power of capital and from all forms of oppression, violence, and exploitation, and a beacon pointing to the real path towards achieving genuine freedom and establishing social justice and brotherhood of the working people. A fraction of this personified conscience of mankind is in the heart of every communist and every revolutionary who proudly counts himself among the great army of fighters for the socialist and communist renewal of the world.

"The secret of the eternal youth of Leninism lies in the fact," noted Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, "that the teaching of Lenin, his principles, and his ideals

are close and intelligible to the masses of millions, and that each generation of people finds clear answers in it to questions troubling them. It lights the way for mankind into the future, and bring peace and progress to the peoples of the whole earth."

As the world community moves forward and becomes enriched by hitherto unprecedented experience, all the new facets of the grandiose contribution Lenin made to forming and developing contemporary civilization and the peoples' liberation struggle of the peoples are revealed. His services to mankind are truly boundless.

Leninism--the Marxism of our revolutionary epoch--has become a powerful material factor in the world's revolutionary transformation, having seized the awareness of the many million-strong working masses whose vanguard is the international workers class and the communist parties. For them, Leninism has become an inexhaustible source of inspiration in the struggle against reaction and oppression, against rotting and parasitizing capitalism, and for socialism and peace.

The boundless energy and gigantic ideological-theoretical and revolutionary practical activity of Lenin, and the whole sight of his genius were needed to defend revolutionary Marxism, to creatively enrich and concretize it in conformity with the conditions of the contemporary epoch, to arm the international workers class with a whole scientific system of philosophical, economic, and sociopolitical views which reveal society's laws of development of the struggle to overthrow capitalism, and of the creation of socialism, to exemplify in practice the implementation of noble communist ideals and to give the world proletariat a colossal impulse to move along the path of social progress. The selfless labor and truly heroic life of Vladimir Il'ich were wholly devoted to serving the fundamental interests of the masses of people and to the present and the future of mankind.

As P. Togliatti noted many years later, Lenin gave back the creative character to the teaching of Marx, liberated it from the pedanticism of pseudo-materialist, economic, and positivist interpretations, and thereby made Marxism into what it should be--leadership in revolutionary action--by firmly taking up the positions of Marxism from his activity's very outset, grasping its revolutionary nature and proletarian internationalism, and completely mastering materialist dialectics. Lenin led the struggle of the revolutionary trend of international social democracy for exposing all the various types of opportunism, and for complete differentiation from them, and for uniting the world workers movement, having scientifically analyzed the new epoch of world history and comprehensively founded and developed the teaching about imperialism, war, peace, and revolution.

A great scientist and peerless master on revolutionary strategy and tactics, Lenin succeeded in organically joining a strict and supreme scientific approach with the spontaneous struggle of the popular masses. He raised and practically resolved the question of instilling socialist consciousness in the workers class, and posed and resolved the problems of creating a revolutionary party of a new kind. He worked out the theory, which fully justified

itself in practice, of democratic movements developing into socialist ones, and scientifically substantiated the necessity of transitional stages on the way to socialism, the strategy of class alliances of the proletariat in the struggle for democracy and socialism, and the indissoluble link between social and national liberation. Lenin fundamentally elaborated the theory of socialist revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which has withstood the test of history brilliantly, comprehensively substantiated the principles of science and art of the political leadership of the revolutionary struggle of the masses, generalized the experience of bolshevism as a current of political thought and a political party, and the world's first experience in building a new society, drew up a comprehensive program of the socialist reconstruction of life and of building communism, and substantiated the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The Marxist method of analyzing reality, creatively elaborated by Lenin, his rich theoretical legacy, and the practical experience of the Bolshevik Party, which was nurtured by him, in preparing and carrying out the October Revolution and in transforming society on socialist principles--all this has entered the treasure house of the world workers and communist movement forever, and represents an invaluable property of all revolutionary-liberation forces on this planet.

Leninism has rightly become a truly universal and most influential ideological force of the contemporary period, possessing huge vitality and effectiveness, playing a powerful mobilizing role, and exerting an unremitting influence on the development and perfecting of real socialism, the struggle of the international workers class, and the course of the national liberation movement.

Never in history has human society known such a stormy shock, such a qualitative leap in its development as that which was accomplished by the Russian proletariat under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party formed by Lenin, which rose in the vanguard of revolutionary struggle. "They stirred up everyone," Rabindranath Tagore, the great son of India, said of Lenin and the bolsheviks precisely and laconically. And the prominent French humanist and writer Romain Rolland characterized Lenin's significance for the fate of the world thus: "His will so profoundly plowed up the chaotic ocean of flabby mankind that the trace will not disappear from the waves for a long time, and henceforth the ship will rush in defiance of the storms and with all sails set forward, toward the New World... His spiritual image imprinted itself in the hearts of people while he was still alive, and will remain imperishable through the centuries."

Of course, the world today is already far from what it was in the period when Lenin lived, created and fought. Thanks to its unwavering loyalty to Leninism, the CPSU has been able to overcome all the difficulties which have fallen to the lot of the land of the soviets, and has successfully led the Soviet people to where, to use the words of Lenin, there was "neither carriage nor road, nothing at all, just nothing that had been experienced before" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 416). Our motherland has become an indestructible stronghold of the socialist system. The level of

the material and spiritual maturity of Soviet society has risen incomparably, a society today resolving the most complex of problems of perfecting developed socialism under the leadership of the party. The world socialist system, which exerts a huge influence on the course of the development of all mankind, has achieved considerable success in building a new society. Fundamental changes have taken place in the conditions of the struggle which the workers class in capitalist countries is waging for its social liberation, and the role of this class has sharply increased in contemporary political life. The peoples of the former colonial and semicolonial periphery of imperialism have advanced to the level of independent historic creativity. The objective interests of many scores of young independent states are coming into conflict with the aggressive policy of domination and diktat that is conducted by imperialist powers. All this is an obvious and indisputable fact, and it cannot be ignored without risk of losing touch with reality.

Our class enemies and bourgeois and reformist ideologists, who have been compelled in one form or another to acknowledge the changes which are taking place in the world, nevertheless constantly attempt to cast doubt on the fundamental principles of Leninism and to declare them allegedly as no longer corresponding to changed social conditions. As practice shows, attempts of this kind, which are becoming more and more frenzied and refined as the role and influence of Lenin's ideological legacy increase, by their very essence differ very little from those attacks to which Lenin and his revolutionary teaching were subjected by bourgeois figures and opportunists at the beginning of the century or immediately after the victory of the October Revolution. Before and now, they basically amount to vain attempts to present Leninist teaching either as "dogmatism" and "schematism," or, on the other hand, as "a hardening" and "revision" of Marxism "from the left," and as its adaptation to purely local, Russian conditions, by virtue of which, they say, it cannot be of international and universal significance.

However, in fact both "dogmatism" and "revisionism" are equally alien to Leninism, and are organically incompatible with its revolutionary nature. Defending Marxism from opportunist corruptions and distortions, Lenin always resolutely stood up to attempts to turn it into dead dogma, and energetically fought for a careful and at the same time creative attitude toward the revolutionary theory of the workers class.

The fundamental difference between Lenin's creative attitude toward Marxist theory and all the various forms of revisionism with which the history of European right-wing social democracy teams, lies in the fact that the tenets of the great revolutionary teaching worked out by the founders of scientific socialism, which have been tested in practice, have not been discarded, as they have been by the revisionists of all colors beginning with Bernstein, but have been developed by Lenin in conformity with changing conditions of struggle.

The secret of the immortality of scientific theory created by Marx, Engels, and Lenin lies in the fact that, in essence, it represents a continually developing, creative teaching. Faithfully reflecting the objective laws of history, and based on the achievements of the progressive social thinking of

the past, this teaching continually assimilates hereto unknown, and extremely varied experience of the struggle and revolutionary-creative activity of the masses, and is daily enriched by the fresh ideas and conclusions engendered by life itself.

Lenin himself provided an excellent example of the bold and creative development of Marxism in conformity with the new epoch. "We most definitely do not regard the theory of Marx," he write, "as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stones of the science which socialists must advance further in all directions if they do not want to lag behind life" (op. cit., vol 4, p 184). "... A Marxist," Lenin emphasized, "must take account of living life, and the precise facts of reality and not continue to cling to theory of yesterday..." (op. cit., vol 31, p 134).

The scientific interpretation by the CPSU and other fraternal communist and workers parties of the whole wealth of new experience of building socialism and communism, and of the struggle of the workers class and the liberation movement as a whole, their careful consideration of changes taking place in the world, and their analysis and generalization of the whole gigantic diversity of social phenomena--this is the source of the constant harmony of Marxist-Leninist ideas in our epoch, which makes them an effective weapon for transforming the world.

Developed at the dawn of the contemporary epoch, Lenin's revolutionary activity and his theoretical legacy have by no means lost their significance, for the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale has far from exhausted itself, and has placed the international workers class in the vanguard of social progress and raised Lenin to the position of its leader. The worldwide struggle for the socialist reconstruction of life continues, assuming new and ever more diverse forms and manifestations, acquiring even more grandiose proportions and drawing new masses of people into the struggle in all corners of the earth. Hence the permanent significance of the ideological legacy left by Lenin, and of his eternally vital method of revolutionary creativity. Hence also the most profound internationalism of Leninist teaching.

Lenin's scientific works are based upon analysis of not only Russian reality, but also of the socioeconomic position of many other countries in the world, and upon the generalization of experience of the whole international workers and liberation movement. The international nature and essence of Leninism, and its genuinely universal character have brilliantly passed the test of social practice itself, and have been confirmed by the course of victorious socialist revolutions in countries in central and southeastern Europe, Asia, and in Cuba, and by the increasing influence of communist ideas everywhere in the world.

It is important also to take another circumstance into account.

Any attempts to belittle the significance of Marxist-Leninist teaching, and to apply to it methods of dismemberment, of selectively snatching individual

fragments, and of various kinds of local interpretation of its component elements and fundamental, basic tenets, in the end place the scientific nature of this teaching in doubt. Meanwhile, repeating the words of Engels, Lenin urged us to always bear in mind that from the time socialism became a science it must be treated as a science (op. cit., vol 6, p 27). As soon as science is based upon an adequate reflection of objective reality it can be neither national nor local by virtue of its very substance and meaning. Both the laws of nature and the recognized laws of development of society have a general and universal character. It is precisely this character which is inherent in the science that reveals these laws and is based on them. Marxism-Leninism, the theory of scientific socialism, is in the sphere of social cognition of this universal science. That is why any kind of attempts to construct "models" of socialism--"national" or "regional," "democratic" or "humanistic"--turn out to be groundless and senseless.

It is another matter that there exist particular features, caused by the concrete situation in some country or another, of the manifestation of general and universal laws which have been revealed by Marxist-Leninist science, and confirmed by the practice of the revolutionary-liberation struggle of the peoples. In this lies the dialectical complexity of the historical process--"united, and natural in all its huge diversity and contradictoriness" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 26, p 59).

Deliberately absolutizing particular and national-distinctive features, and stubbornly refusing to acknowledge the manifestation in them of the essence and basic substance of socialist transformations, the social reformist and bourgeois ideologists have tried over the course of already many decades to ascribe to Leninism, allegedly as being inherent in it, disregard for the specific character of local conditions and for the national and regional peculiarities of other countries, and even the intention of "forcing" some sort of Russian "pattern" upon their people, and of mechanically building the experience of the October Revolution onto their reality. It is true that history refutes these fantasies. A principled and consistent fighter against all stereotyping and schematism, Lenin constantly urged the progressive and revolutionary forces of the world to "apply the general and fundamental principles of communism to that originality of relations between classes and parties, and to that originality in the objective development towards communism, which is characteristic of every individual country" (op. cit., vol 41, p 74).

Lenin never proclaimed the experience of the October Revolution to be some kind of absolute model, fit for all circumstances. He opposed all exaggerations of what had been achieved, and was in favor of objectively showing the international workers class what had really been done as a result of the revolution, what had still to be done, and of explaining "what we have undertaken, how we have undertaken it, and how to understand it" (op. cit., vol 36, p 51). Only thus can one attract the proletarian masses in other countries, push them so that they strive towards socialism themselves, and try to do this even better than the Russian workers class did.

Lenin repeatedly warned communists against simply copying the experience of Soviet Russia. Answering the remarks of some foreign delegates at the Third

Congress of the Comintern, who intimated that Russian communists only want to be imitated, he declared: "We demand the exact opposite. It is not enough to know communist resolutions by heart, and to use revolutionary methods in every case. This is not enough, and we are in advance against communists who know some resolution or other by heart" (op. cit., vol 44, p 18).

Not the letter, but the spirit, meaning and lessons of the revolutionary experience of Soviet Russia--this is what Lenin urged the revolutionary forces of the world to apply and utilize in their countries. At the same time, he sharply criticized those who refused to take into account the general laws and general principles of revolution which had been tested by practice, and regarded this as subordination to nationalistic trends and an inability to rise to a clear understanding of the universal-historical essence of the truth that "the general course of the proletarian revolution is the same throughout the whole world" (op. cit., vol 27, p 505).

The progressive forces of the world do not see Lenin's theoretical legacy as a prescription guide book suitable for all of life's events, but as an eternally living source of revolutionary ideas and experience, providing present and future generations of communists with a key to discovering the main substance of the contemporary era and to resolving its cardinal problems. In exactly the same way, the revolutionary-liberation forces of the world see bolshevism, the experience of the Great October, and the practice of building socialism and communism in the USSR not as a "pattern" or a "mode" for imitation, but as a really revolutionary and international "idea, theory, program and tactic" which takes into account "both the achievements of a peaceful era and the experience of the era of revolutions that has begun." Precisely in this sense, Lenin emphasized, bolshevism "is suitable as a model of tactics for everyone" (ibid., pp 304-305).

Not "schemes" and "aims" supposedly forced upon the world communist movement from without, but an unwavering loyalty to the scientific, and revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism--this is what lies at the basis of the deep community of the strategy and tactics of struggle and of creative activity, and of the community of views, appraisals, and positions of communist and workers parties on fundamental questions of the contemporary period.

Our ideological enemies are not given to understanding the reason why the theory of scientific communism remains an eternally living teaching which inspires millions of working people on every continent to struggle for socialist transformations, and why the popular masses from countries that are completely dissimilar in their historical and geographical peculiarities, find in Marxism-Leninism the answers to vitally important problems of the contemporary period, both within the framework of individual states and on a worldwide scale. All that the enemies of communism can do is state contritely, as the leading American anticommunist journal PROBLEMS OF COMMUNISM did recently, that despite their efforts to turn peoples away from socialism, people throughout the whole world "continue to bow down before the teaching and activity of Lenin."

Under the revolutionizing influence of the example of the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole, and the influence of Leninism, which has

spread throughout the whole world, the ideas of socialism have put down deep roots on all continents, and are now supported by powerful mass movements.

Embodying the ideas of Lenin in practice, building socialism and communism, and activating the social forces that personify peace, social progress, and the future of human civilization--all this is taking place in a situation of acute class antagonism between two opposing world systems, and in conditions of strong pressure from imperialism. As Lenin foresaw, "the greater the pressure from the oppressed classes, the closer they come to overthrowing all oppression, and all exploitation, and the more decisively the oppressed peasants and the oppressed workers develop initiative, independent initiative, the more frenzied the opposition of the exploiters becomes" (op. cit., vol 36, p 442).

As is well-known, Lenin warned against failure to understand that revolution and counterrevolution are most closely linked, and taught us to see in them "one whole social movement which develops according to its own internal logic" (op cit., vol 16, p 119). As historical practice testifies, the development of the revolutionary process and of the struggle of the workers class and the forces of national liberation has always been accompanied by the feeble impulses of counterrevolution, and by its attempts to intercept the initiative of the revolutionary forces and to impose its own "rules of the game." Lenin also repeatedly pointed out the necessity to take into account the ability of the reaction, suffering defeats, to learn from its mistakes "with the greatest avidity." The bourgeoisie, he warned in 1921, has learned from the example of Russia (op cit., vol 44, p 99).

A certain, realistically thinking part of the bourgeoisie has also drawn lessons for itself from the formation of the world socialist system, the collapse of colonialism, and the radical change in the correlation of forces in favor of peace, democracy, and socialism. Compelled to admit the necessity of avoiding frontal attacks against world socialism in the new conditions which have taken shape on a global scale, but in no way renouncing the struggle against Marxist-Leninist ideas, these circles of the bourgeoisie willy-nilly agree to acknowledge the real fact that, in our day, the only alternative to the peaceful coexistence of states from the two opposed social systems is a universal nuclear catastrophe.

The other, most reactionary and aggressive circles of the monopolistic bourgeoisie, which are particularly closely linked with the financial clique and military-industrial complex in the United States, show a striking ability to learn precisely nothing from the lessons of history. Not wishing to come to terms with the new global correlation of forces, and setting hopes as before on applying the methods of diktat and threats, they stubbornly try to break the existing military-strategic parity, and to ensure dominant positions for themselves in the world by any means, so as to be able to impose their will upon mankind by armed force.

And, as has already happened on more than one occasion in the past, the stronger the shocks in the world of capital itself become, the more clearly its ailments and flaws are revealed, and the more intensive the anti-imperialist, antimonopolist actions of the masses become, the more frenzied are

the slanderous attacks on Marxist-Leninist teaching, on real socialism, and on the world communist movement. As always, by lying about socialism, the reaction tries to screen and to camouflage ever more unattractive capitalist reality, to deprive the popular masses of clear reference points in their struggle for a better future and, having clouded their awareness, to postpone the collapse of the bourgeois system.

The method of crude slander and falsification of the aims and tasks of communists is far from new. In April 1917, Lenin pointed out that capitalists and their press together with sorry-socialists "make the utmost noise," trying to slander the bolsheviks, to accuse them of preaching anarchism, to deny the masses the chance of hearing the truth, and to hinder business-like explanation of the communists' position. "What are you afraid of? Why do you lie?" asked Lenin. "It is precisely the truth you fear. You lie to suppress the possibility of explaining the truth, by means of pogroms, slander, violence, and filth" (op. cit., vol 31, p 219).

Today--how many times running in this century already--we are again witnessing the attempts of international imperialist reaction to hide and distort the truth about world socialism, to blacken the ideas and activity of communists, and the policy of the USSR and of other countries from the world socialist community, to force, by means of terror and violence, the popular masses and revolutionary liberation forces to give up the struggle for their rights and for national and social liberation, and to slow down the progressive course of history.

In this lies the deep essence of Washington's course of global confrontation with socialism, of the hysterical anti-Soviet and anticommunist campaign which it has unleashed, and of the large-scale provocations organized by the U.S. special services against the Soviet Union and fraternal socialist countries. In this lies the essence of the adventurist, interventionist course of imperialism in the Middle East, in Central and Southern Africa, and in the countries of Central America and the Caribbean basin. In this lies the essence of the atmosphere of military psychosis forced by the Reagan administration, of the unrestrained nuclear missile arms race developed by the United States, and of the reckless plans to gain military superiority over the USSR and world socialism at any price, and to try to settle a historical score with it. Beginning with the scare of "the Soviet military threat," the forces of international reaction, which are blinded by anticommunism, have reached the point today of declaring "a crusade" against socialism as a social system.

Striving to somehow substantiate their aggressive, militarist course, imperialist circles heap piles of slander upon the Soviet Union and its foreign and domestic policies, and try to present the scientific ideology of communists in a perverted and distorted form, and to instill in people the view that there is supposedly no place for socialism at all on this earth. "But," as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out, "what is desired and what is possible are far from being one and the same thing. No one can reverse the course of history. The USSR and other socialist countries will live and develop according to their own laws--the laws of the most advanced social system."

During the more than 6.5 decades of its existence, the Soviet state which was formed under the leadership of Lenin and the communist party has successfully passed many tests, including severe ones. It is an indisputable fact that all who have encroached on the socialist system--from the white armies and foreign interventionists to the Hitlerite hordes--have invariably ended upon the garbage heap of history. It is also an immutable fact that whatever difficulties have fallen to the lot of socialism, it, like its spiritual basis and motivating force of development--Marxist-Leninist teaching--has only strengthened its positions in the course of overcoming these difficulties and, at the same time, also increased its influence among the broad popular masses, and achieved magnificent new successes in the revolutionary transformation of the world.

Leninism took shape and became firmly established during the most serious battles with the reaction and right-wing and "left-wing" opportunism. It is the ideology of the international workers class, which is mounting a historic offensive. Consequently, Leninism and scientific socialism fear no experiences, and no attacks and undermining actions on the part of the class enemy. There is no doubt that the present attempts of aggressive imperialist circles to move into a counteroffensive against world socialism, to blacken and belittle the significance of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory, and to take social revanche for their numerous failures and defeats, will again be a complete failure as before.

Despite all the complexity and extremely dangerous nature of the international situation, which has been exacerbated through the fault of imperialism, communists and all Soviet people are convinced that the initiative and constructive policy of our party and the Soviet state, which is based on realism, responsibility for the fate of the world, and readiness for negotiations and radical solutions--all bequeathed by Lenin--will make it possible in the end to avert a nuclear catastrophe, wreck the aggressive intrigues of imperialism, militarism and revanchism, bridle the senseless arms race, and uphold and deepen international detent. As the statement of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov of 24 November 1983 again testified, by fulfilling the will of the Soviet people, the Soviet leadership will continue to do everything to eliminate the threat of war, and preserve peace for present and future generations.

Sixty years have passed since the heart of Lenin stopped beating. For all these years the CPSU and the Soviet people, while remaining loyal to the behests of the great leader, have followed along the path which he traced and achieved striking accomplishments in building communist society.

As it was noted in the 24 January 1924 notice of the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks Central Committee addressed "To the Party. To All the Working People," the physical death of Lenin "is not the death of his work. Lenin lives on in the soul of every member of our party. Every member of our party is a little part of Lenin. All of our communist family is the collective embodiment of Lenin."

Time is not imperious with Leninism. For communists and progressive, liberation forces the whole world over, it was and is the science and art of revolutionary creativity, and the science and art to triumph. Again and again

pressing close to the bright and eternal spring of Leninism, the revolutionary forces of the world learn from Lenin how to creatively resolve the new and ever more complex problems posed by life and by the struggle for the vital interests of the workers class and of all the working people.

"Lenin is immortal, because his ideas and deeds are immortal," said Comrade Yu. V. Andropov. "He lives in the achievements of socialism and communism, and in the revolutionary struggle of the working people throughout the world."

There is no other, and there cannot be any other victorious weapon but Leninism for the world proletariat and all who are fighting against capital, rejected by the peoples of the world, and who are building a new socialist world. There is not and there cannot exist any theory, outside Leninism and contrary to it, which would be able to scientifically explain the reality that surrounds us, and to point out the path to the future and lead mankind along this path. Lenin once said of the Russian bolsheviks: "We are raising high our Marxist torch--and at every step of the individual classes, and with every political and economic event, we demonstrate that our teaching is confirmed by life itself" (op. cit., vol 13, pp 163-164). The present generation of communists can also say the same thing about Leninism. With every year and every decade, the conditions of people's social being are changing, changes are taking place in the situation in which they are waging the struggle for a better future, and the forms and methods of this very struggle are altering. But the development of history continues, according to Lenin, and every major and epochal event in the world brings new confirmation of his correctness and the force of his scientific foresight. The supreme demands made upon those who have the proud right to count themselves among the guards of convinced advocates of Leninism also remain unchanged.

Today, just as yesterday, being a Leninist certainly does not mean, as our opponents and reformists of various persuasions allege, seeking ready answers in the practice of the past or superimposing old patterns on new phenomena, proceeding from scientific theory and revolutionary practice, and basing these conclusions on Marxist-Leninist teaching, Leninist methodology of scientific analysis, and revolutionary and communist action. It means carefully preserving and constantly enriching Lenin's invaluable legacy, collating one's plans and policy with the unfading reference points indicated by Lenin, always and in everything being guided by the tried and tested system of fundamental principles bequeathed by him, and by materialist dialectics and proletarian internationalism, and never and under no circumstances leaving "the reliable ground of analysis of class relations" (op. cit., vol 31, p 135).

Being a Leninist today means implementing the principled course of our party without the least hesitation or doubt; firmly and in the Leninist way, showing class irreconcilability toward ideological enemies in whatever fashionable attire they may be arrayed and to whatever lengths of myth creating they may run; the ability to discern and expose them from behind any mask; and consistently and uncompromisingly fighting for them who try to extinguish "the revolutionary spirit instead of supporting and developing it" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 37, p 303).

Being a Leninist in contemporary conditions means helping the peoples and every inhabitant of our planet to realize the danger that is threatened by imperialist circles, and furthering the unification of mankind's efforts in the struggle for right to life, for bridling the forces of imperialism, and militarism, and for stopping the world from slipping into the abyss of a nuclear catastrophe.

Finally, it means constantly preserving revolutionary self-control and discipline, the highest political vigilance, and fortitude in the face of any experiences, showing intolerance toward antisocial elements of any kind, responsibility, enthusiasm, and initiative in work for the good of the socialist motherland and social progress on earth, and if it should be necessary--being prepared to immediately repulse any aggressor. The December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum expressed firm confidence in the fact that "the Soviet people, closely rallied around the Leninist party, will tirelessly continue to strengthen the economic and defense might of our motherland, and apply all of their forces to achieve new successes in communist construction."

Lenin was and is the torchbearer of the revolutionary era. In loyalty to Leninism, in the correct creative application of the laws of social development and of the creation of a new society, as revealed by him, and in the further strengthening of the unity between the party and the people and of the cohesion of the revolutionary forces on this planet--in this lies the guarantee of the coming victory of communism throughout the whole world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984.

CSO: 1802/7

LENINIST CONCEPT OF TRADE UNIONS UNDER SOCIALISM AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 39-50

[Article by Dr of Philosophical Sciences G. Alekseyev]

[Text] The problems of the organization of the struggle and labor of the working class--the leading force in the revolutionary reorganization of the world--hold a main position in Lenin's ideological-political legacy. V. I. Lenin, who creatively developed the doctrine of Marx and Engels on the universal historical mission of the proletariat, enriched and concretized their ideas on the trade unions. He formulated the concepts of the new role of these mass organizations of working people after the victory of the proletarian revolution, when the class objectives and interests of the workers become the main guideline in the policy of the state while the trade unions themselves become one of the most important links within the political system of the society striving toward socialism and communism.

The great value, significance and relevance of Lenin's stipulations and conclusions on the trade unions are emphasized by the circumstance that Lenin was not only a theoretician and ideologue of the international communist and worker movements of our age. He personally took most active and direct participation in the creation of the trade unions in our country and in their ideological and political leadership during the first years of the Soviet system.

The victorious completion of the socialist revolution in the country and the seizure of political power by the working class trigger a radical breakdown of the entire economic and sociopolitical life. The country enters a qualitatively new period in its historical development. It is the relatively long period of building socialism, its comprehensive development and gradual advance toward communism. A radical change takes place also in the activities of the trade unions. It is a question precisely of revolutionary rather than simply evolutionary or partial changes in their work content and methods.

Lenin was the first of the theoretical and sociological Marxists to draw attention to this fact. In his January 1919 report to the Second All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions, he emphasized that "with the greatest change which took place in history, when the proletariat took over the state power, the trade unions are experiencing the greatest upturn in their entire activities" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 451). In this connection Lenin pointed out the inadmissibility of the use of criteria,

assessments and concepts of the "old professionalism" in terms of the trade unions as they develop under the conditions of the new social system. "All the old concepts and categories" of previous policies and "all the old traditions and prejudices of the old science concerning the trade unions, he emphasized, "have been refuted and turned upside down" (ibid., pp 442-443).

Under circumstances in which the working class holds the power and is the master of productive capital, the trade unions become one of the units within the overall system of the political organization of the working people and must structure their work in accordance with the principles of the socialist society. Since the class objectives and interests of the workers become national interests, relations of unity and cooperation are established between the trade unions, as organizations of the working people, and the socialist state, which is the main tool for the implementation of the desires and interests of the working class under socialism.

Lenin most clearly indicated the need to develop the trade unions under socialism as autonomous mass social organizations--nongovernmental and nonparty. According to Lenin, they can and must play an important role in the general mechanism of proletarian dictatorship and, together with the communist party and the state, constitute its very foundation.

The previous attitude of the trade unions toward production radically changes during the period of establishment of socialism. Lenin's works profoundly clarify the nature of the essentially new functions which they assume. The "master" of production changes (now it is the working class, the toiling masses), while his main objective becomes the creation of the necessary economic conditions which will "ensure the full well-being and free and all-round development of all members of society" (op. cit., vol 6, p 232). Concern for the all-round development of public production becomes the determining interest of the working people and their trade unions.

The socialist state becomes the main instrument in the creation of a socialist economy and the immediate instrument for its administration. It develops new ways, means and methods of economic management of a socialist nature. The trade unions assume the major share of the responsibility for ensuring the dynamic and efficient development of public production and the steady enhancement of labor productivity and quality of the work. They enjoy the right to participate in production management on a national scale as well as on the level of the labor collectives of enterprises, establishments and organizations.

Lenin ascribed particular importance to the participation of the trade unions in the formulation and implementation of production programs and plans, establishing internal regulations in enterprises, maintaining conscious labor discipline, organizing socialist competition and disseminating progressive experience. In Lenin's definition, under socialism the trade unions are a school of administration and economic management.

Guided by Lenin's ideas, at all the stages the Soviet trade unions have paid prime attention to problems of developing public production, increasing labor

productivity and improving quality indicators. Under the party's guiding ideological-political influence and on the basis of their own experience they realized the truth that serving the working person and concern for the growth of his material well-being and cultural standards mean above all the all-round development of public production. It was this circumstance which became the foundation for shaping and developing in the Soviet trade unions the most important production-economic function. This means a most active and direct participation in economic construction, production management and solution of production-economic problems on the basis of the development of democratic principles and enhanced labor activeness of the masses. The work of the trade unions in this area, particularly in the organization of the socialist competition, is one of the most important factors in enhancing production efficiency and improving socioeconomic relations, to which the party has always ascribed prime importance, as was reemphasized at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

This trade union function, which develops under socialist conditions, has no analogs and constitutes an essential difference between the socialist type of trade unions and trade unions which develop under capitalist conditions; it goes beyond the limits of their old inherent protective functions.

However, this does not mean in the least that the "protective" activities of the trade unions come to a full stop with the building of socialism and are no longer necessary, as the enemies of the socialist system claim. Lenin was the first to point out the need for the trade unions to retain said function under socialism as well and to identify its features.

In Lenin's views under socialism this trade union function is a manifestation of the "nonclass" economic struggle, in the sense of "struggle against bureaucratic distortions of the soviet apparatus" (op. cit. vol 42, p 297), or the "excessive departmental zeal" on the part of some economic managers (ibid., vol 44, p 343).

Carried away by production activities, such economic managers sometimes pay insufficient attention to the material living conditions and requirements of the working people, and their circumstances at work and at home. That is why, Lenin said, the working class "must defend itself." The broad toiling masses must master the new opportunities and ways and means of defending their rights and interests created by the new social system.

The socialist state and the ruling communist party in the socialist country concentrate their activities on concern for enhancing the material and cultural well-being of the people. "All our efforts in economics," noted Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "are aimed, in the final account, at improving the living standard of the people. This is the main sociopolitical objective of our plans." Hence trade union activities are of a twin nature: they organically combine concern for the material and cultural well-being of the working people and improving their working and living circumstances with concern for the all-round development of public production. This means that under socialism, as Lenin pointed out, the trade

unions must carry out their direct protective function "with the help of a characteristic combination of governmental measures and our accord, our 'blending' with our trade unions" (op. cit., vol 42, p 208), i.e., this must be achieved within the overall framework of the social programs formulated by the party and the state and implemented in accordance with the characteristics and possibilities of the economy at a given stage.

The victory of the new socialist system over the old is possible only after socialism has been established not only in politics and economics but in the minds of the broadest possible toiling masses. In accordance with Lenin's theory, this precisely determines the very great importance of trade union educational and mass cultural activities. In his address to the Second All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions, Lenin called upon them to carry the banner of communism high and steadily to broaden the ranks of the builders of socialism. He pointed out that the task of the trade unions is "to be the educators of millions and dozens of millions of people who would learn through their own experience to avoid mistakes, reject the old prejudices and learn through personal experience how to manage the state and production..." (op. cit., vol 37, p 453).

The founder of our state ascribed great attention to trade union activities aimed at enhancing the general educational and cultural-technical standards of the working people (the task of "learning, learning and learning" was even at that time not the youth's alone), developing in the broad masses a new attitude toward labor and shaping the new sociopolitical consciousness and general and political standards of the individual working person.

When we speak of political standards we have in mind above all the understanding of the historical meaning of the daily ordinary work done by the party and the state and the conscious subordination of the personal interests of the individual not only to those of his collective but the entire socialist state.

We still have many difficulties in production and daily life. There also are open violations of socialist legality, bribery, misuse of power, arrogance and bureaucratism. We must wage an irreconcilable and merciless struggle against them. However, inadmissible in such a struggle are anarchic grumbling, irritation, apathy and depression in case of failure. In developing the political standards of the masses and directing their efforts toward surmounting shortcomings, together with the party and the Komsomol the trade unions pay particular attention to the strengthening of the moral and political unity of the working people and promoting their faith in the just cause of communism and the rightness of the party's ideas and policies. In a word, the development of the political culture of the masses is most closely tied to developing the sociopolitical activeness of the individual working person. The further strengthening of the faith of the masses in the party as well requires a most delicate and persistent work and appealing to the minds and hearts of the people.

Lenin emphasized the unbreakable interconnection among trade union functions and their dialectical unity. "From all sides the trade unions...are a

school, a school for unity and solidarity, a school for the defense of our interests, a school of management, a school of administration," and, as a whole, "a school of communism" (op. cit., vol 42, pp 203, 292).

Substantiating the concept of trade unions as a school of communism is the main feature of Lenin's concept of the trade unions under socialism. Both in the past and today this stipulation is the target of particularly malicious attacks on the part of our ideological opponents.

Real socialism has become the leading economic and sociopolitical force of our time. In proving its great advantages over capitalism in all fields of human life, it exerts a growing influence on the minds, thoughts and expectations of the people's masses throughout the world. By the very fact of its existence socialism undermines the myth of the inviolability and perpetuity of the capitalist foundations of social life.

Hence the malicious and slanderous propaganda campaign waged against the USSR and the other socialist countries and against socialism in general on the part of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its stooges.

As was emphasized at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "imperialism, American above all, is mounting increasingly concentrated attacks on our social system and Marxist-Leninist ideology, unprecedented in scope. It is trying to poison the minds of the Soviet people, distort the objectives of our foreign policy and block the growing influence of real socialism--the main bulwark of the cause of peace and freedom of the peoples. A tense and truly global struggle between the two ideologies is taking place."

In openly announcing the chauvinistic and hegemonistic idea of having the entire world consistent with American concepts, the Washington administration is relying on imposing on the rest of the world (sometimes through military means, as was the example of Grenada, Lebanon and elsewhere) the "American, Western" democracy as the only possible and mandatory one. This insane idea is, among others, the base for the "program for democracy," which was announced in February 1983 and became an official governmental document of the United States after President Reagan signed in November of the same year the bill appropriating some \$63 million for its implementation during the 1984 fiscal year.

All kinds of diversionary actions aimed against the trade unions of the socialist countries are also subject to financing. Intensive use is made of broadcasts by Western "radio voices," introducing illegal publications and disseminating various rumors and fabrications aimed at destabilizing the situation in the socialist countries and helping various antisocialist elements, including those recruited for such purposes by the special services of the imperialist countries, political and economic blackmail and others.

Today the struggle against the "socialist" trade unions and ideological and political subversive actions aimed at destabilizing and "corrupting" them have become a structural component of the aggressive course pursued by the United States and its NATO allies, the purpose of which is the "overthrow" of

communism. Speculating on human rights and freedoms, which are allegedly either lacking or seriously violated under socialism, serves as an ideological cover for this course. The facts are simply ignored or interpreted in an inconceivably distorted fashion.

Let us take as an example the right of citizens to join trade unions. It is not only clearly included in the constitutions and other legislative acts of the socialist countries but is guaranteed by the very nature of socialism and its entire economic and sociopolitical system. The alliance among toiling classes--workers and peasants and the working intelligentsia--is the social base of socialism. The trade unions are one of the most important forms for the exercise of the economic and social interests and needs of the individual classes and the various intraclass groups.

The trade union groups have the objective of directly expressing professional interests and interests based on the type of occupation; there were more than 3 million such groups in the USSR in 1983. The trade union organizations of labor collectives and enterprises, organizations and establishments serve the broad collective interests and tasks; there are more than half a million shop committees and more than 750,000 primary trade union organizations in our country. Finally, sectorial trade unions are created to represent the interests of the working people employed at similar enterprises in the national economy. There are 31 such sectorial trade unions in the USSR.

All in all, the trade union organizations in the country have more than 132 million members. The interests of the membership are also represented and defended by a variety of trade union organs set up by the sectorial trade unions in the territorial and administrative units in the country--rayon, city, oblast (kray) and republic committees. Trade union councils--oblast (kray) and republic--are set up to coordinate the activities of the sectorial trade unions.

The right of forming trade unions is guaranteed by the very nature of the socialist political system. Our opponents claim that the trade unions in the socialist countries are deprived of the possibility of effectively representing and defending the interests of the working people. They are allegedly hindered in performing this function by the socialist state which, as a force "alien to the working class," leaves to the trade unions, as their "appendage" the sole function of "pressuring the working people" and "supervising" them in the interests of the state. It is hard to imagine a more monstrous accumulation of patently false assertions!

How can they claim that this machinery (i.e., the entire system of its legislative and executive power organs) was created by the working people with the direct participation of the trade unions, act as a hostile force toward the working people themselves and their trade unions? It is a fact that the first people's commissariats (ministries) were created in our country on the basis of the specific trade unions. Thus, representatives of the plant committee of the Petrograd Siemens-Schuckert Plant (today Plant imeni Kozitskiy) and the Baltic seamen became the nucleus of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs; the workers of the Putilov Plant and the

plants on the Vyborg side formed the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs and the People's Commissariat of Education; workers belonging to the trade union of seamen and river sailors formed the People's Commissariat of Trade and Industry. The People's Commissariats of Labor and Social Insurance and the other people's commissariats and their local organs were established with the most direct participation of the trade unions.

Today's structure as well of the highest organs of power in our country reflects their profoundly popular nature. For example, 51.1 percent of the total number of the current deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet are workers and kolkhoz members; more than 17 percent are representatives of the sciences, culture, literature, the arts, education and health care, enterprise managers and specialists and military servicemen; the balance are personnel working for state and soviet organs and party, trade union and Komsomol personalities. Such is roughly the structure of the higher legislative organs in the other socialist countries as well. In the GDS, furthermore, the trade unions have their own faction in the People's Chamber.

Trade union representatives in the legislative and executive organs of state management are an exceptionally important channel through which the working people and the trade unions participate in making decisions on problems of national economic development. Thus, the chairman of the AUCCTU is a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; the deputy chairman of the AUCCTU is deputy chairman of the Commission for Legislative Proposals of the Soviet of Nationalities--one of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. AUCCTU secretaries are members of other permanent commissions of our country's supreme legislative organ. Corresponding trade union representation is ensured also in the supreme soviets of union republics and of autonomous republics and kray, oblast, rayon, city, settlement and rural soviets of people's deputies. The collegiums of all ministries and other economic management organs include representatives of the respective trade unions and no single decision, particularly if it is of basic importance, is made without joint discussion and coordination with the trade unions. The central committees of the trade unions represent the interests of the working people directly through the USSR Council of Ministers and the country's planning organs.

Therefore, today as well, in Lenin's words, the trade unions are a "reservoir" and "source" of state power and the "foundation" without which governmental functions cannot be performed under socialism. Although acting in cooperation with the state system, they fully retain their autonomy and develop on the basis of the principles of extensive self-management which they themselves define and codify in their bylaws. This trade union autonomy is guaranteed by the laws. Thus, the USSR Constitution clearly codifies the right of citizens to form public organizations (naturally, including trade unions), which are guaranteed conditions for the successful implementation of their statutory tasks (Article 51). The Foundations of USSR and Union Republic Labor Legislation emphasize that "the trade unions act in accordance with their bylaws and are not subject to registration with the state organs" (Article 95).

In his time, during the fourth year after the Great October Revolution, Lenin noted with satisfaction that "...in all legislation...and in all laws of

essential significance...the participation of the trade unions has been established and their status consistent with socialist principles is guaranteed by the law" (op. cit., vol 43, p 172). As to the present, today our country has a substantial number of laws which, one way or another, define the rights of trade unions. Naturally, what matters in this case is not so much the number but the nature, the spirit of such laws. Without exception, they all lay a solid foundation for the free and efficient implementation by the trade unions of their specific functions. They make it incumbent upon enterprise administrations and other economic managers and officials not to create any obstacles in the activities of these organizations of the working people. Characteristically, the trade unions have been given the right to control administrative activities. The administrations have no such rights regarding the trade unions.

The USSR Law on Labor Collectives and on upgrading their role in managing enterprises, establishments and organizations, in the formulation and drafting of which the trade unions participated directly, is another significant contribution to broadening the rights of the trade unions, particularly in areas where the lofty concepts and objectives of national policy are translated into the language of practice, i.e., in labor collectives of enterprises, organizations and establishments.

In virtually all areas of social development--economic, the regulation of social relations and cultural construction--the trade unions in the socialist countries act as an influential power with a wide arsenal of means and possibilities of influencing the solution of social problems in accordance with the interests of the working people they represent.

If we set ourselves the task of checking the practical implementation of the principles of trade union freedoms and basic rights and guarantees of the working people and their organizations, as codified in international labor conventions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the international agreements on human rights, the Charter of Trade Union Rights and the Universal Declaration on Trade Union Rights, a positive experience in this area may be found precisely in the USSR and the other members of the socialist commonwealth. As to countries which emphatically proclaim themselves models in all areas of democracy, rights and freedoms, it is precisely there that trade union rights and freedoms, as all economic and political rights and freedoms of the working people in general, are constantly and substantially violated.

Today the enemies of socialism are especially whipping up the question of the rights of workers and trade unions to strike. In this case they try to prove that if legislation does not stipulate such a right the working people are deprived of their most effective means of meeting their interests.

The exceptional hypocrisy and pharisaic nature of such views is striking. Let us recall the way the ruling circles in the capitalist countries react when one trade union or another goes on strike. The bourgeois press, radio and television pour mounds of filth and accusations on the strikers. The trade unions are subjected to the concentrated pressure of government organs,

such as huge fines, jailing trade union activists and, finally, as Reagan did to the Air Traffic Controllers' Union, disbanding the trade union itself and forbidding its members to find work in their field. Yet under the conditions of the capitalist society the strike is the only means of the workers in defending their economic interests and social rights from the predatory aspirations of the bourgeoisie. In such a society this form of class struggle waged by the workers is determined by the very nature of capitalism.

As to the socialist countries, let us above all point out the falseness of the statements by bourgeois ideologues and their accomplices to the effect that socialism eliminates the right to strike. No special decree has been issued to abolish this right. In general, socialism does not abolish any of the rights earned by the working class under capitalism, which contribute to its true development and protection of its interests as a class as a whole and its individual groups and strata. To the contrary, socialism abolishes the laws created under capitalism which ban or seriously hinder the right of workers to production management and the protection of their interests.

For example, during the revolution our country abolished tsarist legislation, including that part which proclaimed as criminally punishable and strictly forbidden strikes organized by working people and trade unions.

Two decisive circumstances must be taken into consideration in examining the question of the trade unions' right to strike under socialist conditions.

First, all enterprises, plants, factories and basic means of production in our country are socially owned and the property of the nation. The working class is their owner. Consequently, there is no hostile and exploiting side which could be forced to "part" with some of its income with the help of strikes. Because of this, under socialism strikes and work stoppages can only be a kind of boomerang which causes substantial harm not only to the basic interests and objectives of the working class and the building of socialism but the direct daily economic interests of the families of the workers and the individuals.

Second, the socialist countries have developed the type of mechanism for regulating relations between labor collectives and enterprise administrations which efficiently resolves "conflicts, disagreements, friction, and so on," to use Lenin's words (op. cit., vol 44, p 350) which are possible under socialism as well. They can be resolved, reduced and totally eliminated through the efforts of the trade union and shop committees which exist in every labor collective and which have been granted quite substantial and effective rights in dealing with the administration as authoritative and influential powers, as well as through the efforts of the technical and legal inspectorates, labor dispute committees and representatives within the people's control organs, which supervise the state of labor conditions and safety and housing and living conditions. Furthermore, every member of the labor collective can express critical remarks toward the administration and economic managers on the state of affairs at the enterprise and on the subject of his own professional and personal concerns. This possibility is exercised, as we know, through the worker (general) and trade union, party

and Komsomol meetings, the economic aktivs, and so on. Finally, every working person has the right directly to appeal with letters and petitions to the various party, state and leading trade union organs, the courts, and other bodies within our political system.

Naturally, this applies only to that part of the mechanism more directly related to the trade unions and its primary units. Furthermore, the working people have the possibility of criticizing and demanding effective measures through the other social organizations as well--the party and Komsomol committees and the people's and party control organs.

The problem is to organize this mechanism properly and ensure its adequate work at all times. It is precisely this that the CPSU emphasizes with its steady concern for strengthening the closest possible and live ties between trade union organs and workers, on the one hand, and the masses, on the other, as it implements Lenin's behest of "...Live in the thick of the workers' life, be thoroughly familiar with it,...Be able to earn the boundless trust of the masses through a comradely attitude toward them and concerned satisfaction of their needs"(ibid., p 348).

It is by virtue of these reasons that the use of strikes under socialism by workers and trade unions loses all meaning. In the language of philosophy, the method of strikes is dialectically eliminated, it gradually and by itself is reduced to naught and withers away. That is why, as a rule, under the conditions of a socialist system there is no law to codify something which in practice no longer exists as a necessary phenomenon.

The ideological diversionists of imperialism try to consider problems of democracy and human rights and freedoms exclusively from the bourgeois viewpoint. Regardless of the social system under which they function, all trade unions are imposed criteria, assessments and concepts developed by the bourgeois ideologues. If trade union activities in the socialist countries do not fit their concepts and ideas, they are anathemized.

Our class enemies are particularly irritated by the organic ties between the trade unions and the Marxist-Leninist and communist parties and the principle of party leadership of the mass organizations of working people. Naturally, the ties between the trade unions in the capitalist countries and the bourgeois parties do not irritate them in the least. They try to strengthen them by all possible means. As to ties between communist parties and trade unions in socialist countries, according to our ideological opponents, they represent "party dictatorship." They simply ignore the unquestionable fact that the ties between the communist party and the trade unions are an organic law with deep historical roots.

In particular, it is of major significance that in our country the communist party, which was organized and is operating on the basis of truly Marxist and revolutionary principles, appeared before the trade unions. The latter began to appear on a mass scale during the fiery years of the 1905-1907 first Russian revolution, and the party played a prime role in their ideological-political and organizational establishment and consolidation. This became

possible because, naturally, the communist party and the trade unions share a single mass base. They are organizations of the working class and all other toiling population strata.

It is precisely because of sharing the class and social foundation with the trade unions that the communist party cannot have objectives and interests which would not coincide with those of the trade unions. This circumstance creates an objective base for the party's acquiring the full trust of and tremendous prestige among the broadest possible toiling masses. For example, when our trade unions appeared and during the first stages in their development, as we know, the bolshevik party was not the only existing political party. As Lenin pointed out, in 1906 there were 11 "somewhat significant" political organizations of five basic types (see op. cit., vol 14, p 22). Virtually all of them, particularly the Cadets, the mensheviks and the S.R. worked actively in the trade unions in an effort to impose upon them their own ideological and organizational and political leadership. However, the absolute majority of the trade unions followed not them but the Bolshevik Party.

The same type of "choice" was made by the toiling masses and the trade unions during other periods in our history: between February and October 1917, when after the overthrow of tsarist autocracy the power in the country was seized by the bourgeoisie and its stooges--the mensheviks and the S.R.; during the period of foreign military intervention and civil war; during the period of discussions on the trade unions (end of 1920-March 1921); finally, during the period when class contradictions became sharply aggravated after the country had undertaken to resolve problems of socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization and the Leninist party had to fight the Trotskyite-Zinov'yevite antiparty bloc and the right-wing opportunistic group headed by Bukharin, Rykov and Tomskiy (the latter was chairman of the AUCCTU).

Even the most extreme anticommunist would have to acknowledge that there have been periods in the history of our country when no considerations other than ideological and political would be valid in resolving the question of what party to follow by the working people and their trade unions, and with what party to link their destiny. It was precisely in the ideology and policies of the CPSU that they saw a guarantee for the real implementation of their expectations and interests.

In addition to objective factors, what else played a role in this case? Naturally, it was the ideological and political work of the Leninist party among the broad toiling masses and in the trade unions. Even before the revolution Lenin had pointed out the need for the party, from the very beginning, "to strike a true note regarding the trade unions" (op. cit., vol 47, p 92). In considering the party as the supreme form of the class organization of the proletariat, Lenin called for ensuring that it was totally and unconditionally trusted and supported. He pointed out that the entire working class should act under the party's guidance and come close to the party. This, however, does not come automatically. It requires constant, skillful and painstaking party work among the masses in order to raise them to the level of consciousness and activeness of a leading revolutionary detachment. "It

is insufficient," Lenin emphasized, "to describe oneself as the 'vanguard' or advance detachment. One must act in such a way that all other detachments see and are forced to acknowledge that we are leading" (op. cit., vol 6, pp 83-84).

Our party ascribed particular importance to the elaboration of proper ways and means of managing the mass organizations of working people during the period of building socialism. Lenin pointed out that the party's basic functions concerning the trade unions at that time was to play its "leading, educating and organizing role" (op. cit., vol 43, p 95), to act as a "supreme instance" should conflicts, disagreements, frictions, and so on, arise between trade unions and economic authorities, and to be "sufficiently authoritative to be able to resolve them immediately" (op. cit., vol 44, p 350). Why is it that under socialism the need to "educate" the trade unions by the party and the need for the ideological and political guidance of these organizations of the working people remain?

The point is that under socialism as well the trade unions are a nonparty organization. They become an exceptionally widespread organization which includes virtually all categories of working people. This means that it may include individuals who are ideologically and politically immature and hold erroneous views and concepts.

Lenin pointed out the relative stability among trade unions of political influences which are "a superstructure over the vestiges of capitalism and small-scale production." These influences are of a petit bourgeois nature. On one hand they are S.R. and menshevik; on the other, they are anarchic. "It is only among such trends," he pointed out, "that a certain noticeable number of people who defend capitalism remains,...continuing to believe in the nonclass meaning of the 'democracy,' 'equality' and 'freedom' in general they preach" (ibid., vol 44, p 352).

Lenin emphasized that "only a political party of the working class, i.e., a communist party can unite, educate and organize the type of vanguard of the proletariat and the entire toiling mass which alone can counter the inevitable petit bourgeois oscillations within this mass and the inevitable traditions and recurrences of professional narrow-mindedness or prejudices among the proletariat..." (op. cit., vol 43, p 94).

While fully respecting the principles and norms of intratrade union life and the objectives and tasks which trade unions set for themselves, the party provides them with ideological and political leadership.

In accordance with Lenin's bequests, the party draws attention to the need to display special tactfulness in working with mass public associations, avoiding petty supervision and excessive interference in the domestic life and activities of trade union organizations. On the organizational level such party work is done above all through the party members who are members of trade unions and to whom the party bylaws assign the obligation to set an example of communist attitude toward labor and behavior, to be the true leaders of the masses and to earn their total trust.

Our country's entire historical experience most clearly proves that the party's leadership is the first and most important principle in the successful development and activities of the trade unions. This is clearly codified in the bylaws of the USSR trade unions and of all sectorial trade unions in the country. The party fully trusts the trade unions, highly values their work and respects their organizational autonomy. Good practical cooperation is steadily maintained between party organs and trade unions. It is an important factor in the successful implementation of constructive assignments, whether it is a question of economic or social problems, cultural construction or the spiritual development of the Soviet people.

The trade unions in the socialist countries are a relatively young and dynamically developing social movement of the toiling masses. Many of the features which characterize them precisely as a historically new type of trade union movement have been implemented. This legitimately elevates them to the most advanced vanguard positions in the development of the world labor and trade union movements.

However, characteristic in the development of these mass social organizations under socialism as well, including at the stage of advancement of developed mature socialism, is a "set" of growth difficulties, unresolved problems and contradictions.

Although these difficulties, problems and contradictions are radically and essentially different from those facing the trade union movement under capitalism, they cannot be neglected or ignored in politics. In the opposite case, as life teaches us, even nonantagonistic contradictions could lead to major clashes. "Soviet democracy," emphasized Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, "has had, has and, one may assume, will have difficulties of growth, based on the material possibilities of society, the level of consciousness of the masses and their political standards and the fact that our society does not develop under greenhouse conditions or isolated from a world hostile to us but under the cold winds of the psychological warfare unleashed upon us by imperialism."

Guided by Lenin's doctrine, the CPSU is systematically and steadfastly pursuing a course of improving socialist democracy and comprehensively developing trade unions as one of its most important links. The Soviet trade unions face grandiose historical prospects. Together with the entire Soviet people they are actively participating in resolving the broad tasks of advancing developed socialism. The specific practical objectives and trends of economic activity, socialist competition and the economic, organizational and ideological-educational work of party, trade union and Komsomol organs and soviets for 1984 were defined at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and with the 1984 State Plan for the economic and social development of the USSR. Initially in terms of the activities of all Soviet people, each labor collective and all state and public organizations are the profound assessments and conclusions contained in the speech of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov at the plenum--a most important political document which expresses the socioeconomic policy of the party and Soviet state at the present stage.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

EQUIPMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL WORKER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 51-62

[Article by P. Guzhvin, first deputy chief of the RSFSR Central Statistical Administration]

[Text] Use of Productive Capital From the Statistical Viewpoint

Our national wealth (excluding the cost of the land, the ground and the timber) totals 3 trillion rubles. According to Marx, "the relatively greater use of materials compared with labor marks increased labor productivity and greater social wealth" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 25, part II, p 245). Past labor, as we know, participates in the production process as labor means and objects and the sum total of labor means in terms of value operates as productive capital. At the beginning of 1983 its amount within the Soviet national economy totaled 1,313,000,000,000 rubles. Productive capital in agriculture, which accounts for 21 percent of the total (272 billion rubles), accounts for a substantial share of this amount.

The Food Program calls for the further growth of the production potential of agriculture: by 1990 productive capital in the sector will be approximately 50 percent higher. Furthermore, party and government resolutions emphasize the need seriously to improve the use of the material and technical base already existing in the countryside. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum that "the immediate objective is clear: above all we must bring order in what we have and ensure the most sensible utilization of the country's production and scientific and technical potential. This includes eliminating the lagging in sectors such as agriculture, transportation and services.... I wish to emphasize, comrades, that to ensure the well-organized and uninterrupted work of the entire economic mechanism is both a need for the present and a programmatic task for the future. It is a structural component of the overall process of advancement of our social system."

It is precisely in this connection that it is important to consider what we have and the use we make of available facilities specifically in agriculture.

I

A certain retrospective analysis would be expedient in order more profoundly to clarify the processes related to the use of labor tools in the agrarian

economic sector at the present stage. This would apply to the way the sector was supplied with equipment and the influence this had on the various aspects of kolkhoz and sovkhoz production. The basic means and labor object in agriculture--the land--has not had a monetary assessment in our practice and the other production capital is assessed in terms of value. Naturally, to a certain extent this hinders the analysis, for it is impossible to reduce to a single indicator the efficiency with which all combined labor tools are used. However, as we consider this problem in its entirety, it is important to proceed from the close interconnection between land as a labor tool and the other productive capital.

About 50 million people (31 percent of the 1913 population) were employed in agriculture in prerevolutionary Russia, averaging approximately 2.4 hectares each in crops (89 percent of which in grain crops); per capita power availability was less than one-half horsepower (1916). It would be difficult to estimate in terms of current prices the total amount of productive capital in agriculture. The output it yielded, however, can be determined statistically: based on current prices, in 1913 output per hectare in crops averaged approximately 300 rubles; a worker in agriculture earned slightly more than 700 rubles annually.

It is also important to consider statistical data for 1950. By then socialist product relations had been firmly established in the countryside, the country had withstood the severe trials of the Great Patriotic War and the people were rebuilding the economy. As we know, the damage which the war caused agriculture was tremendous: kolkhoz losses caused by direct destruction or plundering of property totaled 181 billion rubles (in 1941 prices). Nevertheless, compared with 1913, 1950 gross agricultural output was 40 percent higher while the number of people employed in agriculture had declined by 33 percent (totaling 33.2 million people). Areas planted in farm crops had substantially increased (by 24 percent). This had been made possible thanks to the fact that power facilities per worker averaged 2 horsepower while productive capital for agricultural use averaged roughly 600 rubles.

Moving closer to the present, let us consider the year 1965. In 15 years the number of people employed in agriculture had declined by yet another 1.7 million. Power capacities in the sector had reached 232 million horsepower and the value of productive capital for agricultural purposes had reached 77 billion rubles. Areas in crops had expanded as well, totaling 209 million hectares by 1965. With such a scale and labor intensiveness, output per hectare in crops averaged 420 rubles; production per capita had almost doubled compared to 1950. About one-half of the increased output was the result of the development of the virgin lands and the increased size of the crops.

The materials of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum provide a thorough study of the development of the sector after 1965. What is important to us here is the fact that during the 8th, 9th and 10th Five-Year Plans the average annual volume of agricultural production in the country had increased from 82.8 to 123.9 billion rubles, i.e., by 50 percent, and that this increase had taken place virtually without any increase in the amount of land under cultivation. The outflow of manpower from the sector had increased

considerably compared to the previous 15 years. In 1980 there were 27 million people employed in agriculture (4.5 million less than in 1965). This, however, required power equaling 604 million horsepower and 238 billion rubles' worth of all productive capital used in agriculture. In 15 years power availability tripled while capital intensiveness increased by a factor of 3.5.

In noting the considerable progress made by the country's agriculture toward intensification, the May Plenum also pointed out that the growth rates of output had slowed down. Statistical figures confirm this conclusion as follows: compared with the 7th, during the 8th Five-Year Plan the volume of agricultural output increased by 21 percent; it increased by 13 in the 9th and by 9 percent in the 10th. The plenum also noted the reasons for this phenomenon. Bearing in mind the topic of our article, let us single out among them the insufficient effective utilization of the main labor tool--the land--which, in turn, is related to an insufficient level of comprehensive production mechanization and the poor handling and low quality of many types of agricultural equipment. If we consider broad statistical data from this viewpoint, we note that a slowdown in the pace of output occurred above all in labor-intensive sectors. For example, the volume of output of meat and milk in the country (which, taking into consideration the production of feed for such sectors, are precisely the most labor-intensive) remained virtually unchanged since 1975 and even dropped during some years. Particularly adverse production dynamics developed in sectors which are both labor-intensive and in areas experiencing manpower shortages. In particular, a substantial share of fiber flax is grown in the Nonchernozem Zone of the RSFSR, where manpower shortages are grave. Consequently, compared with the 8th and the 9th Five-Year Plans, the gross flax harvest in the country for the 10th Five-Year Plan was 14 percent lower.

Another circumstance should be noted in this connection. While the outflow of manpower from the countryside during those three five-year plans intensified, the practice of harnessing to work in kolkhozes and sovkhozes the personnel of other enterprises and organizations expanded. Half a million "outsiders" had done work in agriculture in 1965; in 1981 their average annual number had increased to 1.4 million. At first glance this is a somewhat unexpected phenomenon. As the expansion of the sector in width was terminated, the need to develop new territories and assign additional manpower to this effect disappeared. Agricultural workers were given energy-generating capacities and other labor tools in far greater amounts than before 1965. The accelerated release of manpower from agriculture under these circumstances should have been expected. Statistical figures confirm, however, that the natural outflow of manpower from this sector is paralleled by increasing the assignment of people from plants and factories to work in fields and livestock farms. In 1981 the share of such workers in the overall number of people employed in the sector was approximately 6 percent (compared to under 2 percent in 1965); they accounted for 16 percent in Tula Oblast, 17 percent in Kostroma and Vladimir oblasts, and more than 20 percent in Ivanovo and Astrakhan oblasts.

Naturally it was no accident that the growth rates declined above all in sectors requiring relatively higher labor outlays per unit of output. In other

words, agriculture, which should naturally be expected to procure released manpower for other sectors, itself began to reduce its pace of development largely as a result of manpower shortages. In order to explain this phenomenon we should consider some characteristics of agricultural production in the period of its conversion to a primarily intensive track from the viewpoint of the efficient utilization of productive capital in the sector.

II

Increased agricultural output as a result of putting to use virgin and fallow lands, as occurred in our country until the 1960s, demanded above all additional power availability. For example, our cultivated area increased by approximately 42 million hectares between 1951 and 1965 or by 23 percent. The plowing of the newly developed land alone required a substantial number of additional tractors.

Circumstances change when the area is not increased but the emphasis is put on production intensification. Naturally, under such circumstances as well energy-generating capacities must also be increased, but in this case they take a different direction. The importance of reserve capacities is particularly increased. As we know, particularly important in intensive farming are the agrotechnical deadlines for the various operations. For example, it is frequently quite adequate to sow spring crops as rapidly as possible. This, naturally, requires corresponding capacities which may not be fully used before and after the sowing. An even clearer example is that of the harvest: the self-propelling combine fleet in grain farming is maintained for a single operation exclusively and its capacity should enable us to harvest the crops on time, thus preserving them from losses. The duration of the process is numbered in hours. If reserve capacities are unavailable, virtually the same amount of work is done but agrotechnical rules are violated and the total output per hectare, naturally, drops.

Increasing the productivity of the land presumes expanding the areas sown in highly intensive crops (rice, root crops). The technology of their cultivation requires relatively higher energy resources. Finally, the development of the second sector in the countryside--animal husbandry--under intensification conditions also requires increased power outlays, electric in the first place.

We have enumerated these factors ignoring the number of people employed in agriculture. It would be more accurate to assume that additional power for purposes of production intensification is needed even if the number of people remains the same. Economic laws, however, call for reducing the share of people employed in the agrarian sector in the overall share of people employed in all economic sectors. Such requirements become stricter today, given the worsened overall demographic situation and the slowed-down increase in manpower resources in the country.

If we consider the problem from this specific viewpoint, it is obvious that under intensification conditions in order to increase agricultural output we need more than the simple increase in energy-generating capacities. Priority

should be given, along with increasing the power-labor ratio, to implementing one of the tasks formulated in the decree of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum: concentrating the efforts on improving the use of productive capital, of which power-generating capacities are a structural component.

In discussing the problem of the use of productive capital economists usually divide it into active and passive. By active they mean tools, machinery and equipment (by the end of 1981 the active share of productive capital used for agricultural purposes accounted for 16.9 percent of the total); by passive they mean buildings, installations and structures. The very terminology and breakdown unwittingly encourage the "condemnation" of buildings and installations when it becomes a question of the use of all productive capital in the sector. If we take into consideration that the share of the active assets in their dynamics shows a certain declining trend it becomes even necessary to justify the fact that passive capital is temporarily greater than active capital.

At this point we should recall Marx's statement that such kind of passive assets, although not being directly part of the labor process "the latter is either totally impossible or at least imperfect without them" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 191). In our country's agriculture the overwhelming percentage of tractors and of other machines and tools in particular, are kept under open skies; similar conditions prevail in the storing of winter reserves of rough fodder and some other items. Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes have no intrafarm roads. If the pretext of "passive assets" is used to hinder the building of roads and premises for the storage of equipment, fodder, fertilizers, and so on, the labor process will mandatorily develop "only in its imperfect aspect," which will adversely affect the efficient utilization of all productive capital. Therefore, their division into active and passive in the study of such efficiency, we believe, can only distract us from considering the essence of the matter.

The USSR Food Program calls for completing in its essential features the comprehensive mechanization of crop-growing and animal husbandry by 1990. According to Marx, consequently, the "principle of machine production--the breakdown of the production process into its structural phases and thus resolving problems through the application of mechanics, chemistry, and so on" (ibid., p 472) should assume a decisive significance. In this connection, it is important to use in our analysis Marx's methodology applied in his consideration of machine production. "Any developed machine system," he wrote, "consists of three essentially different parts: a machine motor, a transmission mechanism and, finally, machine tools or working machines." He also said that "the industrial revolution in the 18th century was based precisely on that part--the machine tools. To this day it is always the starting point in converting artisan or handmade production into machine production" (ibid., p 384).

Statistics classifies the sum total of machines in USSR agriculture according to value. By the end of 1981 their value totaled 37.8 billion rubles in the public farms. This total is broken down into two parts: power machines and equipment--working machinery and equipment (no transmission systems are

singled out, for in the majority of cases their value is added to one or the other of the parts). The value of power machinery totaled 15.1 billion rubles and that of working machinery, 22.7 billion. Their ratio in terms of value, therefore, is 1.51:1. In the process of agricultural intensification, and as "production is broken down into its structural phases," unquestionably the number of problems the solution of which requires a steadily updated set of working machines increases. In this case new power machinery is hardly ever needed, as the existing number is adequate. This precisely is one of the decisive factors in the more intensive utilization of available power-generating capacities.

Available data show that the ratio between working and power machinery in kolkhozes, sovkhozes and interfarm enterprises remains unchanged for a long period of time. It was 1.51:1 in 1965, 1.46:1 in 1970, 1.50:1 in 1975 and 1.50:1 in 1980. It would be interesting to trace the dynamics of this indicator in the country's industry (naturally not comparing absolute values but tracing the nature of the changes). The ratio between working and power machinery in industry is increasing: it was 3.0:1 on 1 January 1971, 3.8:1 in 1982 and, in the food industry, for example, the ratio was 10.1:1 in 1971 and 14.1:1 in 1982; the respective figures for the light industry were 14.8:1 and 19.9:1.

The fact that the number of working machines is not rising as rapidly as it should compared to the increased power available to agriculture may be judged also by the changes in some machine varieties. By the end of 1981 power capacities in the sector were 38 percent higher compared to 1975; this included the power of all tractor engines which had increased by 32 percent. Meanwhile, the number of grain-harvesting combines had increased by 9 percent, of potato pickers by 15 percent, of silage harvesting machines by 7 percent, of corn-harvesting combines by 2 percent, of tractor seeding machines by 13 percent, cultivators by 8 percent and tractor mowers by 3 percent. The number of tractor plows and beet and flax harvesting combines even decreased.

The shortage of work tools may, to a certain extent, be the reason for the idling of power capacities in the farms. In Moscow Oblast, for example, the number of general-purpose power-saturated K-700 model tractors increased from 294 to 1,132 between 1975 and 1981. In 1975, however, the average tractor was used 208 days, compared with 151 days in 1981. Therefore, the tractor fleet almost quadrupled while its operating time increased only by a factor of 2.7.

Frequently the capacity generated by this good power machine clashes with the extremely modest set of equally powerful working machines. Here again the familiar Marxian thesis to the effect that "a machine which does not serve in the labor process is useless" (op. cit., vol 23, p 194) becomes relevant to a certain extent.

III

This analysis enables us to present the following most general picture in the development of agricultural production forces: the 8th Five-Year Plan marked

the beginning of a primarily intensive development of the sectors. Land reclamation began to develop; the countryside began to receive increasing amounts of chemical fertilizers and other chemicals and the size of the cattle and poultry herds expanded. All of this made work more difficult and increased its volume. Industry was supplying an increasing number of tractors which, unfortunately, frequently lacked working machines. The steadily growing process of intensification had to be met with improvised facilities and extensive use of manual labor. During the 9th and 10th Five-Year Plans the overstressed manpower situation worsened. On an average for the Soviet Union the average kolkhoz member had worked 230 days in 1970, 243 days in 1975 and 260 days in 1981. Although the number of kolkhoz members in a comparable range of farms had declined by 14 percent within that time, overall labor outlays per man/days had been reduced by 4 percent only. The most difficult situation, naturally, developed in the underpopulated areas. It was precisely under those circumstances that appeals for help to the urban population became increasingly more frequent.

Meanwhile, lacking the necessary volume of its most essential part--working machines--productive capital failed to yield expected results. Gross agricultural output per ruble of value averaged for the year as follows: 1.01 rubles during the 7th Five-Year Plan, 0.89 for the 8th, 0.69 for the 9th and 0.50 rubles for the 10th.

The power capacities in the sector (666 million horsepower) can yield today far more than they gave the farmer in the past. This, however, requires the full set of corresponding working machines. Their production, during the 10th Five-Year Plan in particular, merely paralleled the growth of the power industry: between 1976 and 1980 their overall volume increased (in fixed prices) by 30 percent, whereas power capacities in the sector increased by 32 percent within the same period. This kind of synchronized growth was acceptable as long as agricultural production increased essentially by increasing the amount of land under cultivation. Intensive farming, however, requires revolutionary changes in terms of the fleet of working machines, thus considerably increasing the efficiency of the use of productive capital in agriculture and, consequently, increasing the rate of growth of output while reducing the number of people employed in the sector.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers recently passed the decree "On Measures for Further Enhancing the Technical Standard and Quality of Machines and Equipment for Agriculture and Improving Their Utilization, Increased Production and Procurements in 1983-1990." In accordance with the Food Program, it calls for ensuring the supply of machines and equipment to the countryside in a variety, sets and amounts needed for the essential completion of the comprehensive production mechanization, which will enable us to do the work within optimal agricultural periods and ensure a drastic decline in labor outlays. It is quite essential that the decree calls for a planned approach to the production not of an uncoordinated arsenal of equipment but of machine systems and technological lines which ensure the comprehensive mechanization of basic and auxiliary operations and the application of industrial technologies.

It is no accident that the party and the government consider resupplying agriculture with new equipment a task of national importance and great economic and political significance. Personal responsibility for its implementation has been contemplated, affecting the leaders of the respective ministries, departments, local organs, associations, establishments and organizations.

Finally, following is one more major characteristic of agriculture in its transition to primarily intensive development. In the use essentially of the natural fertility of the soil the flow of freight in agriculture is essentially one-sided. Most of it consists of the harvest, consistent with the level of extensive farming. The farmer takes to the fields only seeds and a relatively small amount of fertilizers. Under intensification the situation changes substantially and two-sided traffic develops. It is the role of organic fertilizers that increases above all (by 1990 up to 1.5 billion tons will be applied); the use of chemical fertilizers increases substantially, lime-containing materials in particular. Increasing crop amounts will travel in the opposite direction. In recent years goods in excess of 1 billion tons have been taken out of the fields. According to the specialists, each ton of produced goods is balanced by 2-2.5 tons of freight in the opposite direction. Its transportation accounts for a substantial share of enterprise outlays. Loading-unloading and transportation operations account for 40-45 percent of labor outlays and approximately 20 percent of all material and financial outlays in the production of agricultural commodities.

K. Marx wrote that "the revolution in the production method in industry and agriculture has made necessary a revolution in the general conditions of the social production process, i.e., in communications and transportation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 395). Naturally, under the conditions of machine output, in agriculture in particular, other "means of communication" are needed as well. The Food Program calls for allocating to the countryside between 3,000,000 and 3,060,000 trucks and 3.2-3.3 million tractor-trailers over the decade. In terms of our topic, however, special mention must be made of the other side of "communication facilities"--motor vehicle roads. Reliable roads contribute to upgrading the efficiency with which all productive capital is utilized. Conversely, lack of roads absorbs a substantial amount of sectorial resources, energy in particular.

Technology itself develops through roads in agriculture. It ensures the movement of productive capital, manpower, raw and other materials and finished products in the course of the labor process. In the same way that in the field of mechanics the roller bearings made it possible to reach previously unheard-of speeds and loads, in agricultural economics paved roads accelerate traffic, make the technology more reliable and substantially reduce transportation outlays. Let us also emphasize that roads (unlike other types of productive capital) do not require any efforts "to organize their use:" any type of transportation would willingly use a better road. This alone would greatly benefit the national economy as a result of reduced wear and tear of transport facilities, fuel economy, faster traffic, and so on.

The party and the government consider the insufficient development of the road network a weak link in the material base of agriculture. This decade as

well approximately 130,000 kilometers of motor vehicle roads for general use and 150,000 kilometers of roads for intrafarm roads (double the 1971-1980 figure) will be laid in rural areas.

IV

"In order to ensure the continuity of the production process," Marx pointed out, "the elements of turnover capital must be as permanently assigned to this process as the elements of productive capital" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 24, p 189). It is important, therefore, to consider the question of the effectiveness with which productive capital is utilized in agriculture in its interrelationship with working productive assets and the forms of organization of labor used by such capital.

Along with their basic productive capital, the kolkhozes and sovkhoses always have another type of material resources. Some of them are used as working capital, i.e., as means of production which transfer to the product their entire cost; another part is the finished but as yet unsold output. Together, they are known as material working capital. Naturally, it is most advantageous when production increases at a fast pace with minimal amounts of material working capital. In this connection, the decisions of the party and the government call for maximal economy of material resources and for a reduction of their specific outlays per unit of output. At the same time, the functioning of the manpower, which is using increasingly powerful productive capital, must take place on the basis of full saturation with raw materials and other labor objects, in order to avoid "empty" runs, i.e., the underutilization of labor tools.

If we trace the changes in the volumes of productive capital and material working assets in their dynamics, we see that their sum total grows more slowly than the value of productive capital. Between 1966 and 1982 this total in agriculture increased by a factor of 2.8, including a 3.6 factor in the volume of productive capital. In the past as well productive capital in the sector increased faster compared with material working assets. At that time, however, the sector was developing primarily in width.

We believe that such a lagging in the growth rates of material working capital, working funds in particular, became one of the reasons for the reduced efficiency in the use of productive capital. Let us incidentally note that in the country's industry productive capital and material working assets are increasing at a roughly similar rate. Between 1966 and 1982 their total amount increased by a factor of 3.6, including a 3.8 factor in the growth of productive capital. As we know, the processing industry frequently experienced shortages of agricultural raw materials.

In the way that the fleet of working machines must grow faster than energy resources in the course of the conversion to intensive development in the sector, a certain acceleration in the growth rates of material working capital is needed as well.

The situation in animal husbandry is a clear example of this. Compared to 1965, in 1970 overall fodder resources in the sector in all farm categories

in the country had increased by 18 percent. The size of herds had increased by only 7 percent, including cows by no more than 0.4 percent. Fodder is the basic part of the working capital in animal husbandry. Its volume per head of cattle, therefore, increased over the five-year period from 22.5 to 24.8 quintals. As a result, the annual amount of milk per cow increased substantially (from 18.5 to 21.1 quintals) and so did beef production (from 101 to 133 kilograms). Livestock productivity increased in poultry and hog breeding. Compared with 1965, in 1970 production in the country had increased by 23 percent for meat, 14 for milk, 40 for eggs and 17 for wool.

These indicators changed differently during the 10th Five-Year Plan. Compared to 1975, in 1980 standard cattle herds had increased by 5 percent. However, working capital in terms of fodder increased only at a similar pace and fodder outlays per head of cattle remained virtually unchanged (correspondingly 25.1 and 25.7 quintals). In terms of comparable prices, animal husbandry output increased by 5 percent only (i.e., approximately as much as the size of the herds). The productivity of the basic types of cattle declined and gross meat and milk production in the country remained virtually on the 1975 level.

It is in this connection that the USSR Food Program stipulates as a main direction in increasing output, milk in particular, the increased productivity of cows. In general terms, three-quarters of the planned increase in animal husbandry output for the decade should be the result of increased weight, milk and eggs. In turn, this can be achieved only by achieving a faster growth rate of working capital in terms of fodder compared with the rate of increase of basic livestock herds.

Intensification in crop growing as well is related to increasing the volume of working capital in terms of organic and chemical fertilizers and other material resources which ensure maximal loads for the labor process and an orientation toward high end results.

So far we have discussed the material prerequisites for the effective utilization of productive capital. This does not lower in the least the decisive importance of the manpower employed in agricultural production. Particularly important here as well is its skill and initiative in reaching maximal effectiveness in the utilization of materials represented by productive capital. It is obvious that the equipment supplied to kolkhozes and sovkhoses can be successfully used only by specially trained workers. The number of rural mechanizers is increasing steadily. There were 3.1 million such workers in 1965 and 4.5 million by the end of the 10th Five-Year Plan. Today such workers account for one-fifth of the overall number of workers employed in public farming (12 percent in 1965). Nevertheless, there is a shortage of mechanizers in the countryside and, consequently, the possibility of better utilizing the created potential is hindered in a number of kolkhozes and sovkhoses. According to statistics the country's agriculture has more than 5 million tractors, combines and other mechanisms requiring proper handling (1982). It is natural to expect that at harvest time virtually the entire equipment is put to work and its use is improved if a double-shift system is used. However, as we pointed out, there are 4.5 million mechanizers in the

sector, i.e., approximately 90 per 100 mechanisms. On the territorial level, naturally, cadre availability differs. In Ivanovo Oblast, for example, this indicator does not exceed 72 percent; it equals 67 percent in Tula and 73 percent in Vladimir oblasts. Under these circumstances mechanizers are assigned to the farms from plants and factories. Understandably, they do not have the necessary skills for crop growing and their interest in end results are different from those of the local population. Naturally, the task of staffing the kolkhozes and sovkhozes with permanent cadres becomes a priority.

The theoretical need for cadres may be computed on the basis of the respective standards. The real need for them on the individual farms largely depends on the method of labor organization and management applied. The method of combining manpower with productive capital plays an essential role in the socialist economy. It is particularly important in agriculture, however, where every year, season and day, man is forced to make one-of-a-kind decisions, taking the uncontrollable factor of the weather into consideration. The forms of labor organization must be such as to grant him the broadest possible autonomy in this area. At the same time, they must stipulate that the satisfaction of the material and other interests of the workers is directly related to the efficiency with which the land, the equipment, and so on, are utilized.

The entire history of our agriculture is saturated with efforts to find better forms of labor organization. They have been different at the different levels of development of production forces in the sector. Under intensification conditions labor tools are being put in the service of the people on an unparalleled scale. It is important in this connection to see the way in which the forms of production and labor organization can influence the attitude of the person toward productive capital.

We already noted that economists sometimes tend to separate such capital into active and passive. We believe it more expedient for this division to be applied to the animated share of the production forces, i.e., the agricultural workers. A passive attitude toward labor tools develops when such tools are used by man for "machine" earnings, when a person is paid on the basis of cultivated hectares, transported tons, size of herds, etc. Conversely, man displays an active attitude toward labor objects if the size of the wage is based on achieved end results, taking into consideration all outlays per unit of output. Under such circumstances the person changes his view on the needed amount of equipment and, above all, its structure. Inevitably, priority is given to working machines and the need for manpower is assessed more accurately.

The type of attitude shown by the people toward labor tools at one period or another may be determined on the basis of the dynamics of changes in labor productivity and wage indicators. With the active utilization of the assets, labor productivity grows faster than wages. The ratio during the 10th Five-Year Plan was different. Compared to 1975, in 1980 the generating of gross income in the kolkhozes per average annual worker did not increase. It totaled 1,500 rubles, while wages per man/day increased from 4.54 to 5.52 rubles, i.e., by 21.6 percent; labor productivity in the kolkhozes, computed

on the basis of gross output, increased by 15 percent over the 5 years. In the country's sovkhozes as well the growth rates of wages during that period were higher compared to the growth of labor productivity.

These data indicate that in practice still quite widespread is a system under which earnings depend only indirectly on end results. Particularly active studies have been conducted in this respect in recent years in order to make the forms of labor organization in agriculture consistent with conditions governing conversion to machine production in the sector. Science and practice prove that the collective contract is most suitable to this end at the present time. The question of its application in kolkhozes and sovkhozes was especially considered by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. It is a question above all of eliminating anonymity in the use of the equipment. Machines should no longer serve as a direct tool for earnings but become one of the means of obtaining end products. This is helped by the collective contract.

At this point formalism becomes very dangerous, when one or another subunit is described as contracting while in practice anonymity in the utilization of the equipment is preserved, cost-accounting principles are violated, and so on. Elements of formalism in the organization of the collective contract in agriculture may have an objective base. It is assumed that a link or brigade is given equipment, land and other material resources and that it is precisely with such a structure of assets and cadre skills that a specific subunit could carry out essentially with its own forces the entire set of technological operations which ensure the production of the planned volume of finished goods. If a link is given nothing but "horsepower" without a corresponding set of working machines, it would be unable to make full use of the advantages of the system. Under such circumstances it would have constantly to seek the aid of outside manpower and the volume of such aid could become critical when the integrity of the cost-accounting unit becomes virtually impossible to preserve. In other words, the material base of the brigade contracting method in agriculture is a system of machines in which, in accordance with Marx's definition, "the labor object follows a consecutive series of interrelated partial processes carried out by a chain of different yet reciprocally complementing working machines" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 390). It is necessary for at least the main part of this chain of working machines to be put at the disposal of subunits working on the basis of the collective contract.

Other essential requirements mandatory for its application exist as well, such as voluntary and autonomous participation, scientific planning, skilled accounting, and so on. However, let us single out precisely the system of machines as the material foundation of such a form of organization of production and labor. The collective contract has long been familiar to agriculture. However, until now the kolkhozes and sovkhozes lacked the necessary number of working machines in order to supply them to the majority of their primary subunits. It is precisely now that agriculture has reached a stage for and the possibility has appeared of extensively spreading the collective contracting method as the most efficient form of labor organization in the primary unit of machine production. The results are indicated by the experience of our best collectives.

It is well-known, for example, that in the Kuban, a mechanized link headed by V. Ya. Pervitskiy, has been working at the experimental farm of the Scientific Research Institute for Testing Tractors and Agricultural Machinery, starting with the end of the 1950s, on the basis of a collective order. The end results of its labor are known. In terms of our topic, however, it would be useful to consider the cost at which such results have been achieved. Following are the 1982 figures: the link has 1,600 hectares in crops, including more than 500 hectares in sugar beets and corn for grain. The collective has 13 permanent mechanizers (including the link leader), seven of them with first and five with second grade of qualification. They have 14 tractors and 147 units of various working machines, worth 135,000 rubles. In 1982 output per hectare here averaged 501 quintals of sugar beets, 53 quintals of winter wheat and 81 quintals of corn grain. These indicators exceed similar average results for the kray by respectively 55 percent, 61 percent and almost 100 percent. In terms of cash, the link produced more than 1 million rubles' worth, i.e., almost 70,000 rubles per mechanizer. The overwhelming share of the work was done by the link itself. In summer it resorts to outside aid equalling approximately two additional average annual workers (13 percent).

Therefore, in Pervitskiy's link the individual mechanizer cultivates an average of more than 100 hectares in crops, more than one-third of which are highly intensive. The link is helped by the fact that on an average there is more than 10,000 rubles' worth of various working machines per person, constituting the necessary system for comprehensive mechanization in the growing of such crops.

This indicator is not fantastic in the least. Today any one of the 4.5 million mechanizers in the country averages approximately 5,100 rubles' worth of working machines, including machines for animal husbandry. This is a value indicator which, naturally, is important. No less important, however, is the material structure of working tools which would enable us comprehensively to mechanize the growing of all crops raised in the country. The major difficulty today lies precisely in securing such a machine system. Many such systems are as yet to be designed followed by the organization of their mass production.

As to the size of labor productivity reached by Pervitskiy's link the conclusion is obvious: in order to cultivate all the fields in our country (227 million hectares) we would need 2.3 million mechanizers with the same skills and equipped with corresponding machine systems. In that link gross farm output per 100 hectares in crops averaged 61,000 rubles in 1982. On a national average, during the 10th Five-Year Plan the entire agricultural output, including animal husbandry, per 100 hectares of cultivated land was 55,00 rubles, including 25,000 from crop growing.

These data indicate the advantages of the brigade contracting method if based on its specific material and technical facilities and organized by people with the necessary level of skills.

In accordance with the resolutions of the 26th Party Congress, the country's agricultural complex has been singled out as a separate object of planning

and management. The November 1982 and December 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums emphasized the need to work in such a way that the huge funds channeled into the implementation of the Food Program yield returns already today and even more so tomorrow. We believe that particularly important now are efforts related to improving the utilization of productive capital. Such a study conducted on the individual farms could indicate means and possibilities. Improving the structure of productive capital is of great importance, so that the increasing power capacities may be utilized fully with a full set of working machines and mechanisms. In turn, this will enable us, with an absolute decline in the number of workers, substantially to increase resources of working capital. Under the conditions of the application of the latest progressive forms of organization of labor and management, oriented toward high end results, the steadily strengthening production potential in agriculture and the other sectors within the agroindustrial complex will begin to yield full returns, thus enabling us successfully to reach the planned levels.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

AUTOMATIC CONTROL SYSTEM IN A RURAL RAYON

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 63-74

[Article by L. Gigineyshvili, candidate of technical sciences, A. Kobaidze, first secretary, Telavskiy Raykom, CP of Georgia, and Kh. Repp, candidate of economic sciences]

[Text] The May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum stipulated that each rayon, oblast and republic should have a planned and implemented efficient system of steps for the struggle against losses and for ensuring the uninterrupted work of procurement, transportation and trade organizations.

Harvesting the crops is a responsible and difficult period in the life of farm managers and specialists, kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers, working people in procurement and processing enterprises and transportation and trade personnel. They are faced with the most noble and the most responsible task of gathering everything yielded by the fields, plantations and gardens promptly, without losses and with minimal outlays, processing and selling the crops and delivering them to the consumers. The economic efficiency of the harvest is determined above all by the maximal reduction or, which is even better, total elimination of losses and increasing labor productivity and capital returns.

The gravity of the problem is due to the fact that our crop losses remain very high, above all in harvesting and transportation. No significant changes leading to their decline have as yet been achieved. We have still not learned how to make efficient use of labor, material and financial resources and the productive capital available to the farms and enterprises, for which reason the end results as well are not always high. Particularly substantial losses are suffered in the harvesting transportation and marketing of perishable produce such as vegetables and fruits, including grapes and even tea.

Computations have indicated that outlays of labor and material and technical facilities in the harvesting of grain crops, for example, account for more than one-half of all outlays related to the full production cycle. At harvest time the need for mechanizers significantly exceeds the size of this category of kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers. A stressed situation also develops in the case of transportation facilities and other machines and equipment. The annual mobilization of many thousands of urban residents and a large number of motor vehicles taken from other economic sectors to ensure the

prompt gathering and hauling of the crops are forced and expensive measures which create a number of difficult economic and social problems.

The strict conditions under which the harvest takes place and the need to complete it within the shortest possible time face the organization and control of the harvest with inordinately strict requirements. Yet problems related to the development of a scientific control system for harvesting grain crops, vegetables, grapes and others are still understudied and underdeveloped. Essentially, control at harvest time is largely reduced to the hasty elimination of breakdowns which arise in the work of the various production units, and to a simple "patching up of tears." However, it should be a question of a basic solution of the problems of upgrading agricultural production efficiency and of expanding scientific and planning work required to this effect.

The USSR Food Program, which was adopted at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, presumes the close unification of the efforts of the rural working people and industrial, transportation and freight sectors which service agriculture. The program embodies a target and a comprehensive approach to resolving the food problem. It is essentially a new step in the planning and management of the socialist economy.

The successful implementation of the Food Program calls for improving the economic mechanism and, in particular, streamlining the organizational management structures and the development of automated control systems in all sectors and units of the agroindustrial complex. Naturally, the conversion to a new form of organization of production and management should not be carried out by eye, intuitively, but in accordance with the conclusions of contemporary science, based on practical experience. It is precisely on the basis of such positions that the elaboration and application of a control system for target crop-harvesting programs was formulated and applied in the Georgian SSR between 1977 and 1983.

Extensive experimentation aimed at improving the economic-mathematical and social methods and organizational forms of managing complexes of technologically interrelated production targets in Abashskiy, Makharadzevskiy and other rayons in the republic and the application of the ASU [automatic control system]-Rtveli (in Georgian "rtveli" means harvesting the grape) in Kakheti, the ASU-Tea in Lanchkhutskiy and Galskiy rayons and the ASU-Vegetables and ASU-Milk in Gardabanskiy Rayon in Georgia confirmed their expediency and enabled us to define the basic methodical directions to be followed in establishing and operating ASU on the level of the decisive--rayon--unit in the management of the agroindustrial complex. Telavskiy Rayon in Kakheti which applied the ASU-Rtveli pioneered this rather large and complex economic experiment.

The ASU-Rtveli is a target program for the harvesting, transportation and delivery of the grape harvest to primary wine-making plants in the rayon. The control system for this program includes organizational, methodical, mathematical, informational and technical support, which guarantees the efficient implementation of the targets on the scale of the agricultural rayon. The high pace of harvesting, transportation and delivery of high-quality

grapes with minimal outlays is thus achieved with the help of the use of a scientific system of organizational measures, streamlining information flows and applying modern economic-mathematical methods, computers and office equipment and dispatcher control systems. The ASU-Rtveli considerably improves the efficiency and quality of managerial work on all levels and the strengthening of performing discipline, the moral and material interest in end work results on the part of all partners in the agroindustrial complex and the creation of more favorable conditions for the economic and social development of the rayon and the entire republic.

Scientists, specialists and party workers joined efforts in conducting this experiment. In the first place it was precisely the party organizations and their managers who had to convince the people of the need for such an experiment and that it was erroneous to assume that everything which could be picked had already been taken from the vine, that the vines could yield no more and that everything had long been organized as far as the harvest itself was concerned and no innovations were required. Afterwards, when the Automatic Control System had been developed and its experimental testing began, it was precisely the rayon party committee which headed the application of managerial novelties. We must point out that in all rayons in which the ASU-Rtveli was subsequently applied, the first raykom party committee secretaries headed the rayon grape-harvesting headquarters.

Reality proved that only the closest possible alliance between the scientific collective and the economic organizations, headed by the rayon party committee, yielded the best possible results under this complex new development. This was confirmed also by the experience of other experiments well-known throughout the country, which were conducted in Abashkiy (Georgia), Vilyandiskiy (Estonia) and Talsinskiy (Latvia) rayons, on the establishment of rayon agroindustrial associations, which can be found now in other parts of the country as well.

This is understandable, for the introduction of any major management innovation involves surmounting established views and work procedures established over a long period of time. For example, it was considered that the more people are sent to pick the grapes the faster they will be picked and, therefore, the faster they will find their way to the wine plant and the consumer's table. Consequently, year after year managers of farms and rayons tried to send as many people, trucks and other transport vehicles to the vineyards as possible. At grape harvest time help was sought even in Tbilisi. Otherwise, it seemed, simply no work could be done.

The first conclusion reached by the scientists, specialists and party workers who organized the experiment, however, was entirely unexpected to all. Computations made with the help of a computer indicated that the rayon could cope with the harvest with its own manpower without traditional sponsorship aid or recruitment of additional manpower. Yet in Georgia alone tens of thousands of urban residents and a large number of motor vehicles were sent to help pick the grapes. Projected on a national scale, in frequent cases this was a high cost for an imperfect production organization.

The use of economic-mathematical methods, modern computers and means of communication in controlling an intersectorial process, such as the harvesting, transportation and delivery of the grapes, is based on its ever-increasing complexity. The difficulties which arise in this case are caused by the volumes of output and amounts of processed produce, which increase with every passing year, the need to balance during the harvest the daily plan assignments of agricultural enterprises, transportation facilities and wineries with delayed deliveries or lack of operative information needed for the efficient control of production processes and the effect of other spatial and temporal factors, including a variety of random events. As shown by theory and convincingly confirmed by practice, it is impossible to cope with such difficulties successfully and fully without ASU.

It is important to emphasize that the ASU-Rtveli is basically different from traditional automated data processing systems as practiced in information-computer centers. In this case we are dealing with an information-control system which includes a republic or regional computer center operating on a time-sharing basis and rayon staffs with dispatcher control systems which gather information on a daily basis from the farms, and engage in the operative processing and transmission of management decisions with the help of modern communications facilities such as teletype, radio and telephone.

The following problems are dealt with within the ASU-Rtveli framework:

Drafting an efficient schedule and establishing a daily work plan for harvesting the grapes by variety, in accordance with the actual production capacities of the farms and the wineries, crop and sugar content forecasts for the individual vineyards and data on the harvest during the previous days;

Defining the daily load of the wineries and plants for primary wine processing, based on the handling capacity of these enterprises and their specialization in processing specific grape varieties;

Selecting optimal routes for the transportation of the goods, minimizing the overall run of the trucks in fulfilling the farms' plans for picking the grapes and establishing the rational loads of primary wine processing enterprises;

Determining the number of harvesters and trucks needed to fulfill the daily harvesting plan;

Simulating the processes of the picking, transportation and delivery of the grapes with a view to forecasting the course of the harvest over the next few days, 10-day periods or the entire period of the harvest as well as for assessing the efficiency of the decisions made and the formulation of suggestions and recommendations.

Furthermore, the ASU-Rtveli enabled us comprehensively to mechanize the records of the goods delivered to the state and organize the daily summing up of the results of the socialist competition.

Securing the prompt delivery of the produce to the consumers, fully protected and with the lowest possible losses, is the objective on which the efforts of transportation and processing enterprise workers are focused with the operation of the automatic control system of the rayon agroindustrial complex. This was achieved in all rayons in which the ASU-Rtveli and ASU-Tea were used.

The effective control of the gathering, transportation and delivery of the grapes and the drafting and transmission of current information on the course of the work were accomplished by rayon staffs with dispatcher services, especially created for the period of the harvest. In all rayons the first raykom party secretary was the head of the staff during the application stage. The necessary current information supplied by each kolkhoz, sovkhoz, processing enterprise or other management project goes to the dispatcher center where, as a rule, two or three people are employed on a temporary basis.

The flow of data and figures showing the quantity and quality of the grapes, brigade productivity, number of pickers (several thousand people) and trucks (approximately 500-600 per rayon) and, finally, the state of affairs at the primary wine processing plants are all data which must be analyzed in order to find the optimal variant for the harvest strategy. The data are processed and proper recommendations issued with the help of a computer operating in Tbilisi and the computer center of the State Committee for Agricultural Production of the Georgian SSR. It was precisely the computer which indicates on a daily basis to the staff workers the number of people and trucks which should be sent to a specific place, what are the most efficient transportation routes and what pace should be maintained during the harvest.

The efficiency with which the ASU was applied was reflected in improvements in the specific indicators of economic indicators of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, processing enterprises and transportation and other organizations. Thus, for example, truck idling in the hauling of the grapes declined by an average of a factor of 2.06 in all eight Kakheti rayons; the average volume of grape deliveries by picker increased by a factor of 2.5. The harvest time was reduced by an average of 12 days, i.e., by a factor of 1.6. Higher labor productivity made it possible to release more than 3,000 people per rayon and save about 600,000 rubles on wages.

In the application of the ASU-Rtveli particular attention was paid to the quality of the grapes delivered for processing. The practical harvesting plans took into consideration the ripeness of the grapes and their sugar content. This enabled us considerably to upgrade the quality of the grapes. The reduced idling of the trucks, particularly at the wineries, enabled us to reduce and, in frequent cases, virtually to eliminate transport losses (grapes must be processed in the first 4 hours after picking). The result of all of this was that capital outlays for developing and applying the ASU-Rtveli, which totaled 263 rubles, were recovered in a few days.

The daily listing of the winners of the socialist competition, the increased role of material and moral incentives for speeding up the gathering of high-quality produce and its prompt delivery for processing, within the ASU framework, yielded substantial economic and social results, although difficult to assess accurately.

In speaking of the social consequences of the application of the ASU let us emphasize that they were manifested above all in the considerable reduction in labor outlays and working time losses, strengthening the performing discipline of managers and farm specialists and all working people within the agroindustrial complex, increasing their responsibility for end work results and higher labor activeness.

We realized that only the system which truly covers the activities of all performers within a given technological cycle is efficient. This applies to workers in basic and auxiliary production, enterprises and organizations servicing agriculture and the management apparatus, ranging from the worker and kolkhoz member to the first secretary of the party raykom. It was precisely such an ASU that we were able to apply in our practical work.

The numerous reasons for breakdowns in the rhythm of the harvest, essentially of organizational nature, were brought to light in the course of the application and operation of the ASU-Rtveli; a number of inconsistencies were detected in the previous ways and means of management on the level of the farms, their individual subunits (sections, brigades) and enterprises, as well as on the rayon level. All of this, naturally, led to making the necessary corrections in the system of organizing the production, labor and management of the harvesting, transportation and delivery of the grapes. Working within the ASU regimen became a true economic management school for all. Let us add to this that it was precisely the ASU-Rtveli which became one of the most interesting practical games played at the Institute for National Economic Management of the State Committee for Science and Technology of the Georgian SSR, where managers and specialists of the agroindustrial complex are upgrading their skills. With the help of a modern computer the students themselves found the best variants in organizing the crop harvesting process.

The creation of the ASU-Rtveli was highly rated by the republic's party and economic organs. "We believe," said E. A. Shevardnadze, CP of Georgia Central Committee first secretary, "that this measure marks the beginning of a new era which may be described as automated agriculture control, and we are proud that it was started specifically in viticulture, which is a traditional Georgian farming sector." The creators of the ASU-Rtveli were awarded the State Prize of the Georgian SSR. The CPSU Central Committee, after its recent discussion of the work of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee on improving the management system, enhancing the level of economic work and rationally utilizing resources, positively rated its activities on the elaboration and application of efficient methods in managing the agroindustrial complex on the rayon and republic levels and the use of ASU in a number of rayons, thus helping to improve the utilization of manpower and material resources.

The further development of the ASU-Rtveli presumes the establishment of a complete information data bank on all qualitative and quantitative indicators related to the rayons' vineyards. The solution of this problem will enable us substantially to upgrade the operational efficiency of the system. To this effect, currently the microzoning of vineyards in Telavskiy Rayon is

taking place. It is precisely this that will enable us to create a corresponding information data bank and, on the basis of machine processing, to forecast the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of future grape crops. Completing the work on improving the ASU, which was started in 1982, will enable us to follow the implementation of agrotechnical schedules and control the entire course of agrotechnical operations related to viticulture in Telavskiy Rayon.

Extensive work is currently under way to create automatic control systems in other subsectors of Georgia's food and agroindustrial complexes, including tea growing. It is no secret that the old glory of Georgian tea has become somewhat tarnished.

One of the reasons for this situation is that the quality of the tea leaf is sacrificed for the sake of quantity. Frequently not only the uppermost leaves but the lower, coarser leaves are picked. This drastically increases the labor productivity of the tea pickers and procurement volumes. However, the quality of the raw material drops tangibly. This, however, is not the only reason for the worsened quality. Most of the valuable tea spoils as it is moved along the "plantation-transportation-factory" technological chain. It is well-known that if the picked tea leaf is not immediately processed, if it has to wait even for a few hours, the tremendous efforts of the tea growers become wasted. It is precisely the uncoordinated activities of leaf pickers and transportation and processing enterprise workers within a specific territorial-production complex which result in the fact that many of the splendid qualities of the Georgian tea are lost.

The study of contracts signed between tea factories and agricultural enterprises in the rayon, concluded long before the start of the harvest, proves that if both sides observe the stipulated conditions, the tea factories can secure the acceptance and processing of the entire amount of tea leaves stipulated in the procurement plans without violating technological requirements. The same applies to the agricultural enterprises: if they were to pick the tea leaves on the basis of the so-called strategy of evening up peaks in amounts not exceeding the production capacities of processing enterprises, they would be able to fulfill and even overfulfill their production plans without quality losses.

However, under the old management system such coordinated work between farms and tea factories was virtually impossible to achieve. That is why upgrading the efficiency with which the agroindustrial complex functions in the production and primary processing of tea leaves with the help of modern management ways and means is a major national economic problem.

As in the case of the ASU-Rtveli, the automatic control system for the picking, transportation, delivery and primary processing of tea leaves (ASU-Tea) operates like a man-machine system based on the use of modern means of communication, computers and economic-mathematical methods.

In 1982, most of the output in the Georgian rayons where the ASU-Tea was applied, was delivered on time to the tea factories and processed. The usual

lines of trucks waiting disappeared. Whereas in 1981 only 10 percent of the goods here could be rated as first-quality, the figure reached 22.5 percent in 1982. The initial experience in working with the ASU-Tea also revealed a number of problems without the solution of which no efficient functioning of the agroindustrial complex for the production and primary processing of tea leaves could be secured.

This mainly applied to the adequate information support of the control process. Yet without prompt, full and reliable information on the planning and technical and economic work indicators of all units within the complex (agricultural enterprises, reception centers, transportation organizations, tea factories and others) it is difficult to rely on any efficient management, efficient decisionmaking, and prompt intervention in the harvesting process with a view to eliminating arising hindrances. In 1982-1983 particular attention was paid to the elaboration and application of subsystems for information support for current control in the harvesting and procurement of tea leaves.

Another important problem related to the formulation of daily planning assignments for the picking and processing of tea leaves, balancing the capacity of tea factories and their assigned procurement farms and the monthly plans of both enterprises was resolved at the same time. Resolving within the ASU framework of the problem of "daily planning the harvesting and processing of tea leaves by strictly assigning producing farms to tea factories" makes it possible to assign to the farms the volumes of tea leaves to be gathered, balanced against the handling capacity of the respective tea factory, and thus ensuring the implementation of monthly planned assignments and reducing to a minimum the number of "peak" days in factory work. The amendment of daily planned assignments to farms in relation to the capacity of the tea factory, carried out within the framework of the ASU, enhances the percentage of high-grade raw materials in the overall harvested amount by encouraging the delivery of goods by farms which fulfill and overfulfill planned assignments for procurements of high-grade tea leaves. The tea factories, the capacity of which remains insufficient as a result of the significantly increased volume of tea-leaf procurements, have reached the limits of their technical possibilities. That is why overfulfilling the daily planned assignments of the farms for picking tea leaves is as severe a violation of the plan as its underfulfillment. In this connection, a system for economic incentive has been formulated and applied within the framework of the ASU, aimed at encouraging farms which work stably within the stipulated plan, while punishing those who underfulfill or overfulfill their planned assignments.

On the surface the regimen through which the automatic system encourages the farms to work seems extremely rigid. Practical experience has proved, however, that it allows the individual worker to break down his working time far more freely. Clearly aware of his daily assignment, the person himself divides his working time between the public farm and the private plot. Such a system promotes in the individual working person discipline and responsibility. Labor standards improve. The practice according to which the monthly plan for tea-leaf procurements was fulfilled in 2 or 3 days, in the

course of which virtually all shoots were stripped down, thus disturbing the plant's growth, is a thing of the past. It is precisely such rushing that drastically lowers the quality of the tea and disorganizes the work of the tea processing factories and the transportation system. The ASU-Tea enables us to put an end to such rushing and its adverse consequences. That is why the CP of Georgia Central Committee ascribes such great importance to the fastest possible application of automatic control systems for picking and processing tea leaves in all tea-growing rayons in the republic.

The effectiveness of the regional ASU-Rtveli and ASU-Tea, as practical experience confirms, is greatly superior to that of traditional sectorial ASU on both the economic and social levels. This confirms the desirability of the extensive application of the ASU-Rtveli and ASU-Tea, which could be used by most rayon agroindustrial associations. Extensive work is currently under way to develop the ASU-Rice in Krasnodar Kray. A number of processes in agricultural production require automated control precisely on the rayon level and scale. This is convincingly confirmed by the experience in the creation of automated control systems not only in Georgia but in other republics as well.

Thus, for example, studies of the volume and flows of control data made in Kharyuskiy Rayon, Estonian SSR, have been under way for the past 10 years. Plans for automatic production control systems were formulated and are being implemented. All 28 kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the rayon already have an information-dispatcher system. On the rayon level a unified integrated system for processing economic data was created, which includes the planning of agricultural production, keeping current records and bookkeeping, processing of bookkeeping and statistical data and economic studies. The results of applying an ASU in Kharyuskiy Rayon prove the substantiation and economic effectiveness of such measures. Outlays for the application and operation of an automated control system were recovered in about 1.5 years.

The first part of an ASU was commissioned in Valmiyerskiy Rayon, Latvian SSR, in 1979. The first section of the ASU included a system of processing data of the rayon planning commission and statistical inspectorate, the rayon agricultural administration, the rayon association of the Latvian SSR State Sel'khoztekhnika Association and the rayon consumer union. Annual economic savings from the use of the ASU total some 700,000 rubles and additional capital investments were recovered in slightly more than 2 years. An operative management complex for the agroindustrial association, operating on an automated basis, was applied in the republic's Talsinskiy Rayon. Annual economic savings from the use of this complex are about 250,000 rubles and the recovery period was 2.5 years.

By the end of 1980 the USSR Ministry of Agriculture issued an order for the organization of rayon ASU aimed at resolving in excess of 10 problems in crop growing, animal husbandry and material and technical support of rayon agriculture. Such ASU are functioning essentially on the basis of SM-4 computers, the primary data processing for which is made by the farms themselves. Good experience has been acquired in the application of this innovation, which has been of great use to the farms, in Ruzayevski Rayon, Mordovian ASSR, in

Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon in Krasnodar Kray, and in many other rayons in the RSFSR.

Naturally, the use of ASU raises a number of complex problems. The main users of computer data are the party and economic managers, the personnel of agricultural and processing enterprises, and transportation, construction and other organizations servicing agriculture. As a result, these people lack sufficiently specialized training needed for work in a system of automated production control and daily practical "contacts" with computers. This determines the great importance of maximally facilitating them in such "contacts," and simplifying as much as possible the procedure for retrieving the necessary information. The "contact" language used by the consumers of such data in communicating with the computer should be simple and accessible and as close to the natural language as possible. In a rural rayon the ASU must be equipped with modern display data processing systems. Only in such a case could the expected results be obtained and the volumes and flows of control data reduced significantly.

The effectiveness of the ASU in harvesting the crop also largely depends on the organization of the work of the computer centers themselves. It is indicative that those involved in the application of the rayon ASU-Rtveli refused to purchase new computers and set up computer centers. Instead, they undertook to load existing capacities and services.

The resolutions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum point out the need for systems of information-computer servicing of sectors and enterprises in the agroindustrial complex, based on a unified time-shared computer network.

All the necessary indications point out that the new integrated methods for managing agriculture and its servicing sectors--the Agroindustrial Association of the Estonian SSR and the Georgian SSR State Committee for Agricultural Production--which were created on the initiative of the party and economic organs of the two republics in 1983 on the basis of the now-abolished republic sectorial organs for managing agriculture, its production and technical support, reclamation and water resources, will be able to create and develop collective automated control systems in agroindustrial complexes on a considerably simplified and more efficient basis. Within these management bodies departmental barriers have been brought down and the organization of the work is based on the achievements of the entire set of highest end results. The volume of intrarepublic document turnover has considerably declined within the agroindustrial complex of the Estonian SSR and the size of the central apparatus has been reduced by 12 percent.

The experience gained not only in Georgia and the Baltic area but in a number of other areas in the country, Poltava Oblast in particular, confirms the promising nature of such an organization of the work in automating the management of agricultural production. Here the large modern computer center of the oblast state Sel'khoztekhnika committee services virtually all basic sectors of the agroindustrial complex. The center provides the necessary computations; practical production conferences are also held on the basis of the joint dispatcher center set up here. It is clear that the uninterrupted

use of computers can be ensured more easily and simply if it is at the disposal of the organization which is charged with providing the countryside with technical service.

Controlling the harvest with the help of computers enables us, to a certain extent, to improve accounting as well. As practical experience in the use of the ASU-Rtveli in Georgia indicated, the use of computers allows all management organs regularly to obtain precise figures and data. Their processing speed is increased as well. Thus, the bookkeeping department of the rayon agroindustrial association was able to compute the earnings of all workers participating in the grape harvest in 3 days. This makes it possible to release a significant number of workers employed by the agricultural organs, engaged in rayon accountability and accounting operations.

With in the ASU-Rtveli and ASU-Tea the bulk of the work on information support of decisionmaking falls on the temporary dispatcher service, which consists of no more than 2 or 3 workers who are successfully coping with their assignments. The rayon management staff, which obtains full information on the actual and projected course of the work and a draft plan-strategy for the next day, can thus make an optimal decision of which all rayon farms and enterprises are informed via the dispatcher service. In turn, such farms and enterprises, which have a plan balanced in accordance with their own and centralized resources at their disposal, are provided with all the necessary conditions for normal operations.

Following the example of Stavropol and Krasnodar krays and Saratov, Vinnitsa and Tselinograd oblasts, all the proper reasons exist for applying automatic control systems in grain crop and sugar beet harvesting. It is well-known that despite a relatively high level of mechanization in harvesting grain crops and the improved quality of the equipment of agricultural enterprises, the harvesting period exceeds the optimal time. This leads to huge losses caused by shedding the grain and worsening its biological and baking qualities.

The high productivity of the machines currently supplied to our agriculture particularly increases requirements governing their utilization. Yet there are frequent cases in which grain harvesting combines and trucks are kept idle for long periods of time. Such idling lowers agricultural production efficiency. The elimination of unproductive losses of time and material facilities can be eliminated and the crops can be harvested within the stipulated agrotechnical periods without increasing the equipment only as a result of the efficient and rational organization of the grain crop harvest.

The application of ASU is a realistic and promising way of improving the control system and enhancing the quality of managerial work during the most intensive periods of agricultural work. It is a major opportunity for significantly increasing the efficiency of public production.

Our press is extensively discussing problems related to the further improvement of the economic management mechanism. The attention of the participants in this discussion is focused primarily on finding efficient economic methods

and management levers. Unquestionably, this is a major and topical task. However, the desired results can be obtained only with the comprehensive utilization of all methods and instruments for influencing the production process available to the economic management organs.

In the course of the practical implementation of the ASU projects for harvesting the crops, the authors of this article realized the great importance of specifically the organizational and technical aspects of the matter. The absence of elementary order and coordination of actions in the work of the rayon management organs and the enterprises and organizations under their jurisdiction became apparent in the application of the ASU. It turned out that bringing order through purely administrative methods and streamlining the work on the basis of computations of the organization of production relations and all other work with the help of computers could yield tremendous economic and social results. Naturally, such results become even greater when the results of the use of economic levers in production are added to administrative and organizational measures.

It was established, for example, in the course of preparatory work for the introduction of the ASU-Rtveli that the managers of enterprises and organizations frequently had no specific idea as to where to send and how many people to send at any given moment of the grape harvest and what itineraries are to be followed and to what enterprises the harvested grapes should be taken first. In such circumstances the socialist competition was largely formal, for the necessary accountability and control were lacking. Briefly stated, discoordination and bottlenecks were found everywhere and the work was done in spurts. All of this concerned and irritated the rayon working people. The following fact proves how much easier and more productive the work of the grape pickers became after the introduction of the ASU-Rtveli: previously the average worker picked 200 kilograms of grapes daily, whereas now his output has reached 500.

The ASU enables managers on all levels to make optimal decisions and to issue specific and precise instructions to performing workers at the proper time. Therefore, the ASU makes it possible to put an end to the faulty practice of managing "in general," and relying on appeals and administrative pressure; it makes it possible to introduce efficient order in the work, without which any project would be merely marking time. In his speech at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out that the efficient organization of all work in the center and locally is the primary condition for the successful implementation of the plan.

Labor and technological discipline is substantially strengthened with ASU. Precise computer computations make it possible to issue to all participants in the harvest substantiated work orders, to organize the transportation system according to a strict schedule and to supply on time the pickers with containers. All rayon working people receive prompt data on the implementation on the daily harvesting schedule. Involved in the efficient rhythm of the work, the people are pleased with their efforts. They are confident that these efforts will not be wasted by the inefficiency of sluggish managers.

Substantiated management decisions make it possible not only to save on transportation facilities and fuel in the harvest but, which is perhaps the most important thing, on working time, and to keep the people in good spirits. The AUS-Rtveli made it possible to obtain higher quality goods of optimal weight and higher sugar content. This means that with the same or even lesser outlays in labor and funds the state obtained higher-grade grapes and grape juice, and better-quality wines and other products. In turn, the processing enterprises improved their cost-accounting indicators: production outlays declined and profits went up. The economic interests of the grape pickers were also better satisfied: as a result of higher labor productivity and quality, their earnings increased by 50 percent.

There is no scale with which to determine the moral satisfaction which the people began to experience as a result of their efforts. The introduction of ASU raised the socialist competition to a higher level. Today the rayon is resolving problems of the current summing up of competition results and its publicity on an entirely new technical base. Not only has it become easier to determine the results of the work of the competitors but the results themselves have become more accurate.

The socioeconomic effect of the application of the automatic control system exceeds the rayon framework. Suffice it to say that after the introduction of the ASU the need for trucks declined by approximately 40 percent. The use of urban transportation facilities for the harvest caused a great deal of damage to industry and complicated the work of many enterprises. For example, the use of the ASU-Rtveli made it totally unnecessary for Telavskiy Rayon to recruit urban citizens for the grape harvest. University and secondary school students could now rest normally and study. Under conditions in which the labor productivity of the grape pickers increased by an average of a 2.5 factor, the kolkhozes and sovkhoses were able to cope with the harvest through their own efforts. Unquestionably, the use of automatic control systems in harvesting other farm crops would yield similar results.

It is important to point out that we were able to include the private auxiliary farms in the rayon within the ASU-Rtveli. A procedure was established according to which every owner of a private plot submitted to the kolkhoz board, sovkhos office or rural soviet information as to the time and amounts of delivery of the grapes he had grown. The rayon harvest staff assumed the obligation to supply every owner with transportation based on the request. Initially a number of owners of private vineyards mistrusted such promises. They soon realized, however, that the rayon staff was firmly keeping its word. The procedure had a positive influence on upgrading the productivity of public labor. The people zealously worked at the kolkhoz and sovkhos vineyards with the knowledge that they would not have to hustle for procuring vehicles; the drivers were no longer tempted to violate the labor discipline and make trips "on the side." In summary, all of this improved the psychological climate in the farm and the entire rayon. The elimination of idling and other work breakdowns and unity of word and action have major educational influence on the rural working people. Under these circumstances the reputation of the party and soviet organs substantially improved as well.

The comprehensive organization of agroindustrial associations creates objective prerequisites for the extensive creation of automatic control systems in agroindustrial complexes on the rayon, oblast, kray and republic levels. Unquestionably, the efficient management, planning, accountability and control of economic activities of enterprises and organizations within the rayon agroindustrial association with the help of computers and the formulation of unified coordinated production plans will have far-reaching economic and social consequences.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CS0: 1802/1

HISTORICAL FATE OF SOCIAL ANTAGONISMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 75-88

[Article by USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member Yu. Zhdanov]

[Text] As we know, contradiction is the source of all development. It expresses the profound nature of the object and the real forces of its dynamics. The development of society as well is accomplished through the appearance and resolution of contradictions.

Society is a social organism, an organic entity. This organic entity, however, must not be viewed as dead, frozen and immobile. To the contrary, like any phenomenon and object, by virtue of its internal and essential contradiction, it exists in a state of motion and development. Inevitably, this contradiction is a unity of opposites.

In the history of society the law of unity and struggle of opposites is also manifested in the specific form of social antagonisms. The word antagonism is of Greek origin and means confrontation, rivalry and enmity.

Before we discuss specifically social antagonisms, let us mention that this term is widely used in a number of meanings and in many areas. Thus, a physiologist will describe as antagonistic muscles with the opposite actions of bending and unbending the joints or chemicals substances which excite or depress the nervous system; the theory of antagonistic games is successfully used in mathematics.

Hegel, who did so much for the development of dialectics, used quite frequently in his works on philosophy the concept of antagonism in describing a great variety of actual phenomena. He mentions antagonism between mind and sensuality, man and nature, theory and fact, thought and experience, need and freedom of the spirit, virtue and happiness and the subjective and the objective. To Hegel the idealist, these paired definitions are simply open and opposite ideas within which individual logical categories are contraposed and made reciprocally exclusive. "The concept," Hegel concludes, "encloses these reconciled aspects; life, naturally, separates them, the result of which is a reality which is noncommensurate with the concept and the truth" (Hegel, "Estetika" [Aesthetics], vol 1, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1968, p 108).

Hegel's bitter view of the disparity between the reconciled concept and its finite existence in reality was unquestionably based on the experience familiar to German philosophy of the history of exploitative antagonistic systems. Hegel necessarily expressed the bourgeois individualistic conditions of his age. In considering the abstract question of the interrelationship among individual self-awarenesses in his "Phenomenology of the Spirit," he saw as its specific manifestation the fact that these self-awarenesses "prove themselves and each other in the course of a struggle not to life but to death" (Hegel, "Soch." [Works], vol IV, USSR Academy of Sciences Press, Moscow, 1959, p 101). In this case Hegel comes close to the view of Hobbs, the English philosopher, on the struggle of all against all, which dominates bourgeois society.

Kant, another German philosopher, tried to build on the initial concept of antagonism in his work "The Idea of General History on the Universal-Civil Plane." In his view, antagonism stems from the very nature of man: "By antagonism I mean here the malevolent sociability of people, i.e., their tendency to establish contacts related, however, to a general resistance which is constantly threatening society with division" (I. Kant, "Soch.," vol 6, Mysl', Moscow, 1966, p 11). According to Kant, motivated by ambition, lust for power and cupidity, man lives among his kin whom he cannot stand but with whom he must get along only on the basis of a pathologically forced acceptance. According to Kant morality, law and the gifts of all people can be developed only on a basis of such doubtful niceties. In opposing the preachers of Arcadian idylls, illusions of unanimity, moderation and mutual love in the society of his time, the good and timid Kant finally exclaims: "...May nature be blessed for its refusal to get along, for its jealous rivaling vanity and insatiable thirst to possess and rule" (ibid., p 12).

Kant similarly derives interpersonality and intergovernmental relations from antagonisms. He sees as the source of all benefits of human culture, science and art the natural hostility of people toward each other and their incommunicativeness which trigger their opposite: externally imposed discipline and forced unification and cooperation among people.

Kant's and Hegel's basic and essential error was that, although accurately noting the deformity of the world of exploitation, enslavement of man by man, alienation and violence, they saw them as rooted in the nature of the individual rather than in the dominant social relations.

Human nature is not an abstract concept inherent in the individual and determined by his biological, genetic or any other natural-historical qualities and circumstances. It is determined by the social relations system and the nature of interrelationships among classes and other social groups.

The study of the system of social relations over a huge segment of time in the development of mankind led K. Marx to a conclusion of tremendous significance and universality. "From the very beginning of civilization," he wrote, "production was based on the antagonism among ranks, estates and classes and, finally, the antagonism between accumulated and direct labor. There is no progress without antagonism. Such is the law which civilization has obeyed to

this day. Until now production forces have been developing thanks to this regime of class antagonisms (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 4, p 96).

The dominating but alienated nature of labor, the expropriation of productive capital from the working people and its subordination to the alien, greedy, and hostile will of the owner of productive capital are the sources of social antagonisms in the exploiting society. At the one end of society poverty, decline, ignorance and degradation concentrate, while wealth, science, leisure time for development and creativity bought by the minority at the cost of oppressing the majority are at the other. During those periods, however, no other path of development was open to mankind. "...At all previous stages of development of mankind," Engels wrote, "the production process was so little developed that historical development could take place only within such an antagonistic form and that historical progress as a whole was left to the efforts of an insignificantly small privileged minority while the huge masses were doomed to extract for themselves scant means of subsistence while steadily increasing the wealth of the privileged" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 19, pp 112-113).

The genetic relationship between the contradictions and antagonisms within bourgeois society was exposed within the framework of Marxist theory. As large-scale industry develops, the internal contradictions within the capitalist production method turn into a glaring contradiction and act on the outside as the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 20, pp 277, 282). This antagonism develops into a struggle between the classes, which knows no reconciliation and can end only with the elimination of the exploiting regime as a result of a socialist revolution.

The prime antagonism which reflects the main social relation and basic contradiction of a given age is reflected within the entire system of social relations, politics, ideology, culture, way of life and personal relations. In a strange way it changes most unexpectedly areas of activity seemingly most unrelated to economics, triggering secondary derived antagonisms.

The hostility existing between the sides, expressed through their covert or overt confrontation and trend toward a violent clash leading to the destruction of one or both of them, stemming from the irreconcilable social contradiction created by conflicting social interests is an antagonism; antagonisms are the source of violence, envy, mistrust, intolerance, suspicion, animosity, cruelty, aggressiveness, all kinds of interferences, incitements, eggings on and instigations.

One can only be amazed at the fact that the ideologues of the modern bourgeoisie see in that system of relations manifestations of age-old harmony, justice and a balance of social interests. To the contrary, an antagonism is an incompatibility and irreconcilability between objectively existing social interests, codified within the class structures and triggering the open struggle and clashes among social groups.

A theoretical analysis always requires a specific historical approach to the interests of classes and other social groups, for the nature of their

interrelationships, contradictions and antagonisms does not remain steady. The real picture is worsened by the fact that the individual classes, social strata and social groups have a number of intersecting, clashing and coinciding interests. Based on a specific historical approach, Marxist-Leninist theory enables us to single out and identify the main and decisive among them and to formulate an accurate policy correspondingly. We must always see the basic and secondary interests of classes and distinguish between the true and objectively irreconcilable antagonisms, on the one hand, and the variety of differences in views, traditions, tastes, habits, opinions, aspirations, motivations, needs, acts and actions which shape social groups and national formations and which acquire the nature of antagonisms only under the influence of the main contradiction of the age, on the other. Bourgeois society also gives an antagonistic appearance to differences in the interests of social groups which are objectively neither irreconcilable nor incompatible.

The Marxists do not deny that, compared to the systems which preceded it, capitalism contributed to the fast and tempestuous development of social production forces. In his time Marx pointed out that only the servants of the bourgeoisie and the dolts fail to understand "the greatness of and transient need for the bourgeois system itself" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 28, p 427). Such was the objectivity of a philosopher who deeply hated the capitalist system.

Under the conditions of ascending classical capitalism, however, its antagonistic nature could not fail to appear. The predatory exploitation of manpower and natural resources, unemployment, crises and underconsumption are all internal features inherent in capitalism. Bourgeois social relations not only develop social production forces but lead to their waste. The thrifty, economical, stingy and scrupulous conservation of resources for the sake of profits and their simultaneous squandering and waste, extravagance and luxury are the opposite manifestations of the exploiting system.

The feature of the antagonistic systems is that the natural wealth and variety of human differences assume here the sinister tonality of contraposition, xenophobia, confrontations, rejections, prejudices and, finally, fanaticism and the mania of violence and brutality. Under such circumstances any difference may become an insoluble contradiction.

In bourgeois society antagonism penetrates everywhere, including worker environments, triggering rivalry, strike breaking and dislike between employed and unemployed and between the low-paid and the worker aristocracy....

The methods of contemporary imperialist policy are to promote quarrels and enmity, to divide and pit people against each other, to promote Zionism and anti-Semitism and to set British against Irish, whites against blacks, Shia against Sunni, and Muslims against Hindus. A tortured Lebanon, divided Cyprus, trampled Grenada, the tragedy of the Palestinians, the fratricidal conflict in Chad, and blood in El Salvador and Nicaragua are the fact of our time. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, imperialism has become entangled in internal and international antagonisms, upheavals and conflicts."

The time granted by history to the bourgeois system has lapsed. The regime of class and national antagonisms, which helped for thousands of years the development of social production forces, has exhausted its possibilities.

In "German Ideology," one of their early works, Marx and Engels reached the conclusion that "...The productive forces and forms of communication have developed to such an extent that they have become destructive forces under the rule of private ownership..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 3, p 441). Nearly one century ago, when those words were written, this trend was merely becoming apparent. Today it has become the basic law governing the functioning of monopoly capital in the age of its deepest crisis. Any production force created through the toil and genius of mankind, be it science, technology or people blindly obeying imperialism is converted by it into a destructive force directed, in the final account, against the people themselves.

Everything in the world of antagonisms creates hostile and destructive opposites: construction - destruction; contact - alienation; knowledge - ignorance; beauty - ugliness; and consciousness - elemental force.

Nuclear energy, which flows along the power grids and facilitates labor, is a great benefit for the destinies of the world, economics and culture. As a tool of imperialist policy, however, it triggered the hellish glows of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Chemical production, which appeared from the peaceful uses of man, and which should synthesize drugs, vitamins, fertilizers, fuels, bright dyes and new high-quality materials, has now been harnessed to the militaristic charriot. Western chemical concerns use synthesis in the production of toxic war substances, nerve-paralysis gases, phosphorus bombs, napalm and means for the destruction of the human mind and health and the killing of all life. The successes of contemporary genetics, biochemistry and microbiology are being used by criminal and irresponsible politicians of the American bourgeoisie for the creation of weapons for biological warfare and pathogenic bacteria and viruses. Today we speak not merely of an economical crisis based on uncontrolled development of capitalism but of ecological warfare, ecocide and genocide -- the deliberate destruction of nature and people.

The conquest of outer space offers inordinately broad prospects for the development of mankind. U.S. imperialism, however, extends its dirty paws here as well. The Soviet people condemn the insane program of the U.S. rulers of turning space into an arena of nuclear and ray war.

It would be strictly scientifically accurate to say that the society of antagonisms has exposed its full groundlessness and futility. It is precisely this society which has created the threat of total destruction of all life and the complete doom of civilization.

The progressive social classes, the proletariat above all, must make this fatal tendency clear. Not every one understands the nature and character of social antagonisms. It would be useful in this connection to recall the manner in which G. V. Plekhanov analyzed the gnoseological and psychological sources of opportunism in social dynamics in connection with the problem of antagonisms. He wrote: "The worker -- and by this I mean the intelligent worker -- becomes imbued with opportunism primarily because he fails to see

as yet the entire depth of the antagonism between the class interests on which capitalist society rests. The intellectual -- and I mean the intelligent intellectual -- becomes an opportunist primarily because he can see said antagonism in its entire depth and instinctively fears its sociopolitical consequences. One remains a radical to the extent of the possible ("within himself"); another retains just one possibility: the possibility for further backward motion. The social democrat must spare the first; the second he must fight 'to his last breath'" (G. V. Plekhanov, "Soch.," vol XVI, Gosizdat, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928, p 236). Naturally, it is regrettable that Plekhanov failed to follow his own advice. The picture he presents, however, remains relevant to this day when, faced with the terrible antagonisms of our time, some Western intellectuals adopt a "backward movement" from revolutionism to one variety of opportunism, reformism, etc., or another.

At one point we could find even in Marxist publications the thesis that as capitalism developed and the proletariat intensified its struggle for better working conditions, the forms of exploitation of the working people would soften. Some facts in support of this thesis could be noted during the classical period capitalist development. Today we can most clearly note that in the biggest countries which determine the shape of bourgeois society in the capitalist world the so-called "humanism" of the bourgeoisie is inversely proportional to the technical means of coercion and violence at its disposal. No trend toward easing the class antagonism on the part of the imperialist bourgeoisie -- from Hitler to Reagan -- can be noted. The frenzied animosity of the antagonistic manifestations in capitalist society has proportionally increased from the furnaces of Auschwitz to the fiery storm of Hiroshima. Destruction and death are becoming the object of production and activities. Antiscience, antiart and anticulture, total destruction and megadeath are outlined in the sinister glow of the decline of that society.

History is familiar with numerous attempts to surmount social antagonisms without affecting the economic base of the society. In frequent cases such attempts have been based on religion. Buddhism preached renouncing this world for the sake of Nirvana and reincarnation. The Old Testament sanctified and condoned intolerance, violence and cruelty, while Christian sermons called for the reconciliation of the layman with the world of antagonisms. For long periods of time philosophers actually pitted only moral sermons and pious wishes against social antagonisms. Some, like Nietzsche, tried to justify the world of antagonisms and to shock the philistine by praising exclusivity, inequality and force.

Hegel called for an end to egotistical interests, the elimination of wild longings, blending private with public interests and raising individuality to the level of a lofty universal idea. Mankind is aware of and remembers many humane people who tried to put an end to the world of antagonisms but did not know how to accomplish this in practical terms. Pious appeals to harmony and peace have been sounded for centuries on end from all pulpits and rostrums. Meanwhile, the unconsciously fighting society went on fighting with the same unconsciousness, as Shchedrin pointed out with a bitter smile.

Marxist science provided a solution to the problem of antagonisms. "Bourgeois production relations," Marx wrote, "are the last antagonistic form of the

social production process, antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonisms but antagonisms stemming from the social living conditions of individuals; the production forces which develop within bourgeois society, however, also create the material conditions for resolving such antagonisms. That is why the bourgeois social system concludes the prehistory of human society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, pp 7-8).

The solution indicated by Marxism lies in the revolutionary transformation of socioeconomic relations which create antagonisms, and on that basis the realization of the innermost dreams of people about justice, cooperation and friendship. If we want to see the ideals of love of man, goodness and brotherhood to triumph we must begin by eliminating private ownership and the entire system of exploitation of man by man.

Aleksandr Blok wrote that knowledge of social inequality is a lofty, cool and angry knowledge. This equally applies to antagonisms which are so closely related to social inequality: they must be known precisely for what they are, and it is on this basis alone that the theoretical and practical means for their elimination may be found.

History is familiar with four basic and quite clearly defined types of human social relations. They can all be found within any socioeconomic system but in substantially different manifestations.

The roots of the first may be traced to the natural relations of our animal ancestors. It is manifested in the species, tribal, communal, family and ethnic features. These relations were dominant during the primitive communal system.

The second type of social relations is based on the individual interdependence among the participants in the production process and determines the structure of relations in the slave-owning society and the feudal system. In this case the individual or the enslaved tribe, community or family, reduced to the level of a talking animal, becomes the inorganic condition for the existence of ruling classes.

During the age of capitalist exploitation the exchange of goods among people, which has existed for centuries, becomes the dominant relation. Under the conditions of the domination of commodity-monetary relations an anonymous and impersonal object -- a small piece of paper or a piece of metal -- acquires the fantastic property of enslaving the individual and subordinating all areas of social, personal, political and moral relations to profits, greed, money-grubbing and rivalry.

The second and third forms of social relations exist within the framework of a society based on private ownership. It is precisely these forms which trigger socioclass antagonisms, for they act as an outside force which enslaves people, as a blind and one-sided necessity rooted in self-interest.

Truly socialized production, which appears as a result of the development of large-scale industry based on science and the latest technology and which extends its planned mechanism over the labor efforts of hundreds of millions

of people, is the economic prerequisite for a new social relation. The elimination of the exploiting class and the establishment of national ownership of productive capital is the social prerequisite for the establishment of the new relation. Since a system of free producers can exist only on the basis of planned and organized production within the framework of the entire society and on the basis of the conscious application of the laws of social development, knowledge of such laws is a necessary theoretical prerequisite for its institution. All preceding forms of social relations were established without any theoretical prerequisites whatsoever, spontaneously. The new society cannot appear on this basis. Finally, the political prerequisite for the free association system is the organization of a Marxist-Leninist party, without which society is doomed to blind wandering.

Since the new social relation is not a force imposed on the people but the result of their joint and sensible collective actions, all foundations for social antagonisms become undermined. All preceding types of social relations experience a radical transformation. They lose their ruling nature for society at large and abandon the features of blind elemental forces. At the same time all previous forms of free associations of people, historically formed over the centuries, such as social unions, cooperatives, professional unions, clubs, creative collectives, sports and scientific societies and international organizations, reveal their true historical potential. Everything is put to work and everything turns into a specific method for the realization of the new social relation.

The socialist production method surmounts the antagonistic nature of the previous forms of labor, making it free and attractive. Conditions are gradually created in society for the all-round harmonious development of the individual. As confirmed by the experience of building socialism in the USSR and other countries in Europe, Asia and America, the elimination of private ownership of productive capital eliminates the basis for class antagonisms. It was on this basis that national antagonisms were eliminated as well and relations of friendship and cooperation among nations were established. It has taken an entire age to accomplish this greatest social change.

However, the thousands of years of rule of antagonistic relations among classes and people cannot be surmounted or outlived on the day following the revolution or immediately after suppressing the armed terroristic opposition of the overthrown classes, strata and social groups. The experience of making socialist changes in our homeland in this sense is exceptionally instructive and is of universal and historical significance.

Most concisely V. I. Lenin expressed the essence of the new age with the greatest insight and deep understanding of the meaning of the historical process: "Anachronism and contradictions are two entirely different things. The former will disappear while the latter will remain under socialism" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XI" [Leninist Collection XI], p 357).

The problem of surmounting, outliving and eliminating antagonisms under the conditions of building socialism is complex and difficult. As we saw, its solution begins above all with the elimination of private ownership and all political and social institutions based on it.

The institution of a soviet regime and the creation of a socialist economic sector in the country did not eliminate in one fell swoop previously existing social systems. The working class and the communists faced the task clearly formulated by Lenin of "uprooting the deeper and more enduring roots of the old, presocialist and even precapitalist relations, which are most stubborn in opposing any kind of 'innovation'" (op. cit., vol 43, p 227).

As defined by Lenin, the new young socialist system in the country was accompanied by elements of various socioeconomic systems each of which was characterized by its own traditions and sources of economic, social and psychological antagonisms. Such systems included the patriarchal, i.e., the peasant barter economy, petty commodity output and private and state capitalism. The removal, the surmounting of each one of these specific socioeconomic formations demanded innovative solutions and taking specific political, economic and cultural steps.

The main antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was eliminated as a result of the expropriation of private and state capital in Russia. This process was not accomplished within a single day: it required the establishment of worker control and surmounting the sabotage on the part of the bourgeois specialists; skills of planning and state economic management had to be developed and a new worker-peasant technical intelligentsia had to be trained. The working class as well had to be reeducated. As Lenin pointed out, "In starting a communist revolution, the working class cannot discard with a single gesture the weaknesses and faults inherited from the society of land owners and capitalists, the society of exploiters and extortioners, the society of dirty greed and the personal profit of a few and the poverty of the many" (op. cit., vol 36, p 364). The main feature in this case was the elimination of the antagonism between labor and material and between physical labor and knowledge and the creation of a new type of discipline and a feeling of ownership of the shop, the plant and the country. This could not be done simply, nor is it simple today, as a result of which isolated and residual antagonisms break out.

The process of elimination of the vestiges of previous economic systems also included a trend to which Lenin drew the attention: "...Following the defeat of big capitalism the shoots of a new, petty, speculative capitalism begin to appear in its place" (op. cit., vol 40, p 35). The many speculators, carpet-baggers, grabbers, thieves, scroungers, adventurers and bandits show up as the enemies of a planned socialist control of production and distribution. Petit bourgeois anarchy and element became the main obstacle to state order, discipline and planned control. In this sense the interests of the petit bourgeois element are totally incompatible with those of the socialist state, i.e., they are antagonistic. Noteworthy in this connection is Lenin's view that "the petite bourgeoisie opposes any kind of state intervention, accountability and control, whether state-capitalist or state-socialist" (op. cit., vol 43, p 207).

Socialist changes in a country which includes a wide stratum of petty producers also affects the pace and methods of surmounting national antagonisms. As Lenin pointed out, "the more backward a country is, the stronger is its petty agricultural production and patriarchal provincial customs, which

inevitably result in the strength and stability of the most profound petit bourgeois prejudices, such as national egotism and national narrow-mindedness. ...The withering away of such prejudices is necessarily a very slow process" (op. cit., vol 41, p 168).

The elimination of class antagonisms is a prerequisite and foundation for the elimination of antagonisms on national grounds. On the basis of its class requirements capitalism uses nationalistic prejudices, chauvinism and racism in order to divide the working people and egg on one nation against another. Divide and rule has been the slogan not only of the Roman slave owners but of the contemporary imperialist bourgeois circles as well.

The elimination of national antagonisms is a particularly difficult matter, for they have historically sunk roots in the way of life, customs and mores. It was no accident that Marx warned that "National petty rivalry has sunk quite deeply in the flesh and blood for it to be eliminated in a single day, regardless of what arguments one may use" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 16, p 637).

In our country, the communist party, which expresses the international character of the proletarian liberation movement, achieved a universal-historical victory with the elimination of national antagonisms. The rapid economic, social and cultural development of the national outlying areas, the fraternal aid given to all peoples in resolving such problems and the powerful upsurge in the education, science and arts in previously backward and neglected peoples led to the elimination of national antagonisms. It was on this basis that the ideology of friendship among the peoples was asserted and the moral and political unity of Soviet society was established. Nevertheless, the task remains of systematically educating the working people in the principles of proletarian internationalism; the need remains for pursuing a patient and thoughtful policy in the field of national relations, such as to exclude any privileges to individual nations and ethnic groups. A concerned implementation of cadre policy is needed, ensuring equal and proper representation of all nations in the economic, political and cultural life of all republics, for the population in all of them has long become multinational.

From the very first days of its existence, the Soviet Union proclaimed the ideas of peace and cooperation with the peoples of all countries, thus laying the beginning of the historical process of the elimination of intergovernmental antagonisms, these constant sources of wars, invasions and enslavement of nations. That same policy became the foundation of intergovernmental relations among socialist countries after the revolutionary process had exceeded the boundaries of a single country. Cooperation among socialist countries is taking place on an equal footing. Its purpose is to unify the nations, strengthen economic unity and provide selfless mutual aid.

The policy of peace, detente and cooperation among nations pursued by the communist party and the Soviet state has a truly great universal meaning. It is based on the fundamental fact that the communists have always expressed not only the class interests but the interests of the development of all mankind, something which only people limited by sectarianism could not understand.

In the area of international relations as well our social system offers real means of resolving the basic problems of mankind: the way to establish proper relations with nature, to help the developing countries and to eliminate illiteracy, hunger, disease and poverty throughout the world. Mankind is facing many unresolved problems in the areas of the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy and the development of outer space and the resources of the oceans. Socialism and communism alone can create maximally favorable conditions for the all-round development of man and the further progress of culture and science.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's 28 September 1983 declaration states that "Mankind has neither lost nor can it lose its mind. This is manifested most emphatically in the scope of the antimissile and antiwar movements which have spread on the European and other continents, movements in which people of different social, political and religious orientation participate." This stipulation is of the greatest importance to the fate of mankind. Does it mean that we can forget the antagonisms tearing apart the contemporary world? Not in the least. We cannot ignore the fact that the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are absolutely incompatible and that the capitalist social system remains one of exploitation and slavery, embellished by the appearance of the "free" sale by the proletariat of its manpower, hidden behind the paper flowers of a false bourgeois democracy. We cannot ignore the fact that the socialist world irreconcilably opposes the greedy interests of bourgeois society, the interests of profits and the spirit of enmity between classes and estates, and nations and nationalities. Capitalism is interested in profits, privileges and domination. We are interested in free labor, friendship among nations and the universal development of the individual. Nothing can conceal and suppress these absolute opposites.

The insurmountable fact facing all struggling classes, social groups and social systems is only one, however: preserving the peace, saving mankind from destruction and maintaining the conditions necessary for its further existence and development.

Such is the class position of the proletariat. Unlike the imperialist bourgeoisie, dirtied in the throes of greed, thirst and hegemonism, in the dense traditions of exploitation, plunder, pugnacity, hatred, suspicion and mistrust, the proletariat and its vanguard, the communists, express not only their class positions but the interests of all mankind. The world of antagonisms is being replaced by a system of harmony, peace, work and fraternity among people.

Dialectics teaches us that a means for achieving an objective is true only when it is consistent with the nature, the essence of this objective. That is why Lenin and the communist party have always aspired to eliminate social antagonisms through ways consistent with this noble objective.

It must be said that many very noisy pseudorevolutionaries, who fail to understand the dialectics of development and elimination of antagonisms, took the position of encouraging antagonisms within the new society. The Trokyites tried to fan the antagonism between the working class and the peasantry; the Proletkult supporters fought the progressive Russian culture of the past

naively and blindly. The Makhayev-style attitude toward the intelligentsia was to promote a quarrel between it and the working class. Such methods radically clash with the Marxist-Leninist theory of the elimination, the disappearance of social antagonisms in the course of socialist changes. To inflate and intensify social antagonisms and artificially to implant and to drag them into the new society means to take a step backward in the development of the country and the people.

Socialist social relations are not established immediately, in a single instant. Forces and trends incompatible with the nature of socialist production relations must be surmounted in the course of their establishment and functioning. The objective interests of socialism call for strengthening, preserving and multiplying public socialist ownership, which makes them incompatible with efforts to weaken, reduce, pilfer or undermine it. The basic interests of socialism require the planned organization of the economy on a national scale and beyond it, within the entire socialist commonwealth, on the basis of scientific forecasting and strictest possible accountability, control and discipline. They are radically alien to spontaneity, accident, voluntarism, departmentalism, parochialism, sectorial limitations, lack of discipline and subjectivism. The basic principle of socialism calls for strict control over the measure of labor and consumption and the rigid observance of the principle of payment according to labor. This principle is antagonistically hostile to the selfish interests of parasites, money-grubbers, black marketeers, thieves and bribe-takers.

The stand held by the socialist society and the toiling classes on such matters is monolithic and uncompromising. The efforts of individuals or groups to assert their interests to the detriment of the public ones are hopeless and historically doomed. In the end they will be inevitably uprooted and suppressed as being alien to the profound nature of socialist relations.

Grabbers, thieves, bribe-takers, black marketeers, swindlers, parasites and criminals are the native brothers of capitalism and of all exploiting societies based on the appropriation of the results of someone else's labor. They reflect the external contradiction between socialism and capitalism. They are the remnants of the old society within the new without, however, stemming from the nature of the new society and are not a class.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized the need entirely to eliminate the phenomenon of using state public property and official position for personal enrichment. "If we think about it," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said, "we would see that this is nothing other than undermining the very nature of our system." The party has declared merciless war on such manifestations, realizing that their bearers are isolated individuals rather than a social stratum. Unquestionably, such aspirations shown by individuals maintain antagonistic relations with the social interests.

Lenin always pointed out the complexity of the revolutionary transformation of society and the inevitability of the interweaving of the old with the new within it for a while. The existence of the old is related to the vestiges of antagonistic relations which may abate or flare up at various stages until they have been completely eliminated.

Under the conditions of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism they are caused by the vestiges of the exploiting classes and the nonsocialist elements in the economy and the existence of petty production which, by its very nature, opposes large-scale public production, and by the forms of uncontrolled barter which oppose planned governmental organization.

Ownership traditions and philistine habits are preserved over long periods of time in countries with a large share of petty production and farming and the uncontrolled and unregulated exchange between them. They are manifested in all social areas, including politics, culture and intergovernmental relations.

It was not socialist public ownership or the socialist principles of production organization which led to crisis phenomena in Poland but the vestiges of petty production, uncontrolled trade, omnivorousness toward the bearers of an alien and antisocialist ideology and the attempts imposed from the outside of traditional bourgeois efforts to undermine society by promoting antagonisms within it between the party and the working class, the citizens and the state, Catholics and nonbelievers, and the petty peasantry and large-scale production. We categorically reject the view that this was a transformation of so-called nonantagonistic contradictions within socialism into antagonistic ones.

Let us recall that Lenin pointed out that under socialist conditions antagonisms disappear but contradictions remain. These contradictions determine the functioning of the new society and its progress toward its higher phase. They are the contradictions of life itself, of reality, and the functioning of the social organism within the integrity and differences of its aspects. Lenin considered the unity of opposites the nucleus of dialectics. However, he demanded a specific historical approach to any social phenomenon, including the new social system.

The basic socialist principle "From each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work" is internally contradictory. It reflects a specific historically reached level of development of production forces in society. This is understood by the people, the toiling masses, the working class above all. No antagonistic clashes of interests take place on this basis, for the entire society is aware of the final objective of the movement -- a transition to a higher phase of communism based on the growth of labor productivity, the social wealth and the all-round development of the individual, which reflects the common interest. Under socialist conditions there are no classes bearers of conflicting and objectively irreconcilable interests. Contradictions, however, remain and so does the task of the conscious, sensible and accurate advance within the framework of the contradiction, its timely elimination and the transition to a new stage, a new level of development. The question of the free and conscious progress within the contradiction becomes central. The greatest danger in this case is becoming one-sided, as Hegel noted, "the promotion of a single aspect of the phenomenon to the level of universality and granting it domination over the others" (Hegel, "Politicheskoye Proizvedeniya" [Political Works], Nauka, Moscow, 1978, p 200).

Lenin firmly opposed directness and one-sidedness, stubbornness and ossification and subjectivism in both theory and practical activities. He was against the eclectic mixture of different aspects and approaches. At the same time,

time, Lenin armed the party with a method for moving within the framework of a dialectical contradiction. With the help of a number of historical examples he described the methodology of such motion. During the initial years of Soviet construction the objective conflict developed between the trend of eliminating privileges in the distribution of material goods among the working people, i.e., equalization, and the need for supplying on a priority basis the workers in the sectors of the greatest importance to the country, i.e., those doing shock work. In discussing this situation, Lenin wrote that "The problem is difficult, for one way or another equalization and shock work are useful yet mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, we have learned something from Marxism as to how and when we can and must combine opposites. Most importantly, after 3.5 years into our revolution we have repeatedly combined opposites in our practical work" (op cit., vol 42, p 211).

Conscious progress within contradictions presumes a specific approach also to which of the conflicting sides is leading under a given set of circumstances. Lenin's doctrine of the party presumes controlling its qualitative and quantitative structure. Depending on the circumstances, one aspect or another in cadre policy is given priority. Thus, under current conditions particular significance is ascribed to the quality structure of party ranks, theoretical training, political activeness, morality, discipline, neatness and exigency for the party members. The war years demanded centralization and concentration of organizational efforts. The forms of party democracy became richer and more varied during the postwar period.

Finally, Lenin's approach to social phenomena enables us to define the stages in the development of a contradiction and the time to resolve and eliminate it. Thus, during the period of collectivization the contradiction between large-scale socialist ownership in industry and petty peasant farming in the countryside was allowed. At the same time, the antagonistic contradiction between the last exploiting class, the kulaks, and the toiling classes in the country, was resolved, and so was the contradiction which reflected the double nature of the private farmer, who was a worker but also a private owner. The historical development process cannot be held back: if any given form has become obsolete, if it exists for an excessively long period of time, the danger arises that it may lose its ability to develop or, metaphorically speaking, an old monkey cannot evolve into a young person. The developing form must have a reserve of flexibility, mobility and activeness, for it is only on such a basis that its revolutionary change becomes possible. An artificial delay in its transition to a higher stage threatens society with stagnation.

The trend toward stagnation and motion, conservatism and innovativeness, lack of culture and culture and knowledge and ignorance still clash within our society. They become personified in individuals and groups. They also become sources of conflict but do not ossify within the social structure with their special interests. Under socialist conditions those who reduce the wealth of needs of the individual to his needs for wealth can only expect total failure in the final account. Departmental and parochial bureaucratic interests and narrow group methods and objectives are eventually eliminated by society.

Socialist social relations carry within themselves contradictions which determine the development and functioning of the new society. These are contradictions between aging and new technological methods and old and new methods of production organization, between the level of output and the needs of society and between social institutions which have played out their role and those directed toward the future.

Plekhanov wrote that "social development is understood not by those who discover within it the struggle between the new and the old but by those who can determine where the old comes from (the old which was once new); why does it fail to satisfy the innovators at a given point in time; and what determines the course and the outcome of the struggle between the innovators and the conservatives. That is the entire matter" (G. V. Plekhanov, "Soch.," vol XIV, Gosizdat, Moscow-Leningrad, 1924, p 271). In our society as well such a rather sharp struggle is taking place. Here, however, there are no social or class antagonisms, for there are no classes interested in preserving the old.

The influence of the still quite powerful external capitalist system is the main source of vestiges of antagonisms. In his remarks regarding G. V. Chicherin's letter, Lenin pointed out that the class enemy is trying to impose on us its own forms of struggle.

The new social connection which appears on the basis of state ownership and collectivistic labor methods requires not only the elimination of the old economic relations but also uprooting the traditions related to them. According to V. I. Lenin it is necessary to rework the mores themselves, "which have long been dirtied and depraved by the accursed private ownership of productive capital and with it by the entire atmosphere of squabbling, mistrust, hostility, splintering and reciprocal scheming, which is inevitably created and steadily recreated by a small-scale individualized economy" (op. cit., vol 41, p 107).

At the same time, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism predicted, no society can surmount individual and isolated antagonisms which arise in the clash among different views, viewpoints and tasks, and in the rivalry for success and recognition and peaceful battles for championship in labor, knowledge and love. Relations among people will become free from narrow-minded and selfish interests and the pettiness and mediocrity of squabbles, and cleansed from envy, baseness, prejudices and ignorance. The lofty, bright and optimistic tragedy, the living heir to the tradition of antiquity will come from the clashes between substantive factors of life, contradictions between the natural and the social, the earthly and the universal, the all-human and the individual, freedom and necessity and imagination and reality. Mankind is ripe for such a rich life and must discard the worn shoes of social antagonisms. This is what the communists consider their historic task for the implementation of which they dedicate all their efforts.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

NEVER-ENDING SOURCE OF INSPIRATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 89-95

[Article by Kaarel Ird, USSR people's actor, laureate of the USSR State Prize]

[Text] I am not a young man. That is perhaps why, as the years go by my awareness of time grows and so does the desire to look at the stormy conflicts of our century more and more closely. It is as though the pulse beat of history is felt through facts and events. I find in this the great happiness of my life which I try to dedicate fully to our art and to the Soviet people.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the speech by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, Central Committee general secretary, delivered at the plenum, faced the workers in the arts and any one involved in the development of Soviet socialist culture with new responsible tasks. "The party," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said at the plenum, "supports anything which enriches science and culture and helps raise the working people in the spirit of the norms and principles of developed socialism." Almost 3 years ago I heard from the rostrum of the 26th party congress the words on the historical transforming mission of Soviet socialist art and the great responsibility of the artist to the people, which touched me deeply. Standing among the delegates to the communist forum in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, I was immeasurably proud of the fact that I had had the luck to participate in this historical event. "To live with the interests of the people, to share joy and sadness with them, to assert the truth of life and our humanistic ideals and be an active participant in building communism is the true national form and party-mindedness of art." These perspicacious and binding assessments which were included in the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the congress assumed in my mind a specific content, recalling distant or recent happenings and becoming guidelines in thoughts on the future of our multinational socialist art.

Today, in reading the 1983 decree of the CPSU Central Committee "On the Work of the Party Organization of the Belorussian State Academic Theater imeni Yanko Kupala," which is one more proof of the tireless party concern for the further development of the arts, the theater in particular, one realizes most clearly the importance of this party document which directly applies to all workers in the arts, regardless of the city or union republic in which they work.

"The talent and responsibility of the artist to the people are indivisible concepts," the decree emphasizes. All too frequently, in the course of practical work, we realize the accuracy of this concept which brooks no exceptions. "The task of the theater," the document stipulates, "is to develop intolerance of any violations of the principles and norms of communist morality and to help in shaping an active life stance in the Soviet people." Indeed, art, politics and morality are most closely interlinked concepts. I have realized this from the entire history of Estonian theater art, with which I am familiar not from books and studies but from what is known as a prime source -- life itself.

The Estonian theater has always sensitively reacted to the most significant processes in social life. The professional Estonian theater appeared in 1906, on the crest of the wave of the revolutionary movement which had spread throughout the Russian Empire.

Karl Menning, the founder of Vanemuine, the first professional theater in Estonia, set himself the task of creating the type of scenic art which would reflect most powerfully the features of our national artistic perception of the world. When asked by his opponents whether such a credo meant that one should play the role of King Lear like that of an Estonian peasant, he answered, "Naturally, precisely that way." For it was in the course of the relationship between the old Estonian peasant and his children that the same type of moral conflicts which Shakespeare had detected so brilliantly took place. The tragedy of King Lear, like that of many other characters of the great English playwright, is mankind's tragedy. And every time that I see Yuri Yarvet in the leading role in the film King Lear, directed by G. Kozintsev, I realize that it was precisely the fullest possible expression of the national perception of the world which made Yarvet's King Lear such a unique acting accomplishment.

There are those who believe that the development of Soviet culture should take place through the mechanical mixing of national cultures. I believe this to be totally wrong. Art cannot develop on the basis of directives even if our wish is to achieve immediate results. History proves that the peaks of artistic thinking are shaped gradually but steadfastly. It is in this steadfastness that we can trace the particular logic of history which led, for example, to the unique blossoming of national cultures of the peoples of the USSR.

The development of the Estonian professional theater during the first decades of its life was complex. Estonia, the leading republic theater at that time, in Tallin, preferred the backward operetta genre and Western European situation comedies. The Tartu Vaynemune theater, which was totally adapted to the taste of the local mercantile bourgeoisie, had a similar repertory. Yet these were the largest groups which set the example for many others in the country. The material situation of most actors and directors in bourgeois Estonia was unenviable. The rich "art lovers" were not in a hurry to become patrons and the government was uninclined to be concerned with the growth of national culture. It was only after the people's uprising of 1924 that the authorities set up the so-called "culture fund."

Along with the "official" operetta theater, during the 1920s and 1930s stage associations of worker organizations began to gather strength in Estonia. As a rule, the worker theaters were headed by democratically thinking professional directors. Most such collectives had a short life. Nevertheless, some of them left noticeable marks in the history of Estonian culture. Such was the case, for instance, of the Tallin worker theater which included a group of young graduates of Tallin's theater studio, headed by the talented director Priyt Pyl'droos. Its repertory included many plays by Soviet authors. Thanks to its highly professional level and the ideological standards of its performances it became one of the most popular theaters in bourgeois Estonia.

Toward the end of the 1930s, in contrast to the gradually degrading Vanemuine, in Tartu, the Tartu worker theater resumed its work after an interruption. It was actively supported by the trade unions, the democratic intelligentsia and the Estonian Communist Party, the secretary of which, Paul' Keerdo, became one of the theater's associates.

The repertory of the Tartu worker theater was distinguished by its progressive political orientation and critical attitude toward the Estonian bourgeois system. It staged the Soviet plays "Platon Krechet" by A. Korneychuk, "Growl, China" by S. Tret'yakov and "The Happy Marriage" by M. Triger. The play "Enemies" by M. Gor'kiy, which I had the pleasure to stage, was to open on 1 May 1939, but the authorities hastily closed down the "seditious" worker theater and we were unable to perform it.

The year 1940 was a turning point in the history of our republic. The Soviet system was restored, and Estonia voluntarily joined the USSR. The nationalization of the theaters improved their economic situation. The aktiv of the former Tartu worker theater joined Vanemuine, and I was appointed its artistic manager. As early as the autumn of 1940 we opened the new season with "Death of the Fleet" by A. Korneychuk.

Since that time the stage of the Vanemuine theater has not covered the small plot of land between Chudskiy Lake and the Baltic Sea but the entire huge space of our country, from its westernmost point to Kamchatka.

The first months after the restoration of the Soviet system in Estonia were filled with intensive work for us. Most important changes were taking place in the republic and the democratic intelligentsia, headed by the communists, was in the thick of life. I recall how, after the reorganization of the Estonian army into the 22nd Red Army Territorial Corps I had the occasion to organize within the units of the Second Division elections for soviets. The division included the artillery regiment about which Yukhan Peegel', a professor at Tartu University, was to write the novel "I Fell During the First Summer of the War." A beautiful play was made from the novel, which has been performed by Vanemuine for the past several seasons.

The establishment and subsequent development of Estonian national culture did not stop with the invasion of the Soviet Union by fascist Germany in June 1941 and the Hitlerite occupation of Estonia which followed. An artistic group of Estonian performers was organized between the end of 1941 and the beginning of 1942 in the rear, in Yaroslavl. It numbered some 250 people and consisted of

a song and dance ensemble headed by Priyt Pyl'droos, a drama theater headed by Ants Lauter and a choir headed by Gustav Ernesaks, today people's actor of the USSR and hero of socialist labor.

Our artists fought fascism with their art. The collective performed 1,400 concerts, more than 300 of which in Red Army front line units and subunits. This period became a major school for the ideological-political and professional training of many cadres for the Tallin conservatory and the Estonian state artistic theater. It was precisely in Yaroslavl that Gustav Ernesaks developed the idea which was subsequently embodied in the creation of the world-famous ESSR State Academic Men's Choir.

It was in Yaroslavl that Georg Ots, people's artist of the USSR, developed as a singer. He came to us from an Estonian division, where he commanded an antitank gun in direct combat against the Hitlerites. I knew this outstanding person well and, as party organizer of the ensemble, recommended him for communist party membership.

During the Yaroslavl period we, Estonian workers in the arts, felt ourselves full members of the multinational family of Soviet peoples and experienced the fraternal support and interest of members of other national cultures. After so many years, I cannot recall without emotion the concern which was shown at that time for us and our art by the communist party, the Soviet government and all Yaroslavl city and party organizations. The workers of Yaroslavl shared with us their last piece of bread and drop of milk.

It was precisely during those difficult times that the beginning of permanent and close creative contacts were established between the Estonian artistic intelligentsia and the other republics in the Soviet Union. I recall lively discussions with our Moscow and Leningrad colleagues. Together we discussed and resolved many theoretical problems. It was then that we clearly understood the basic principles of the idea- and party-mindedness of Soviet art. It was also there that we laid the foundations of the systematic study and mastery of the legacy of Konstantin Sergeyevich Stanislavskiy, the great reformer of the Russian stage.

Estonian theater workers were already familiar with Stanislavskiy's name. K. Menning, the founder of Vanemuine, frequently said that to him the ideal in the theater is what the Moscow Artistic Theater was doing. Stanislavskiy's influence tangibly affected the shaping of P. Pyl'droos' creative beliefs. However, it was only in Soviet times that his ideas developed into a true school for the Estonian theater.

In 1943 many participants in the Yaroslavl ensemble were offered the opportunity to practice in Moscow, in the theaters, the art VUZs and the conservatory of the capital. Paul Pinn, Priyt Pyl'droos and myself went to the Moscow Artistic Theater, Stanislavskiy's offspring.

K. S. Stanislavskiy taught that the actor should always proceed on the basis of his own ways and perception of the character. When the actor is on the stage, organically merging with the character he portrays, he inevitably brings to the action his own interpretation of the author's idea.

Stanislavskiy described this phenomenon as the art of experience, which is always national. It was thanks to this art that the performances of the Artistic Theater and plays staged by Stanislavskiy's students and followers are understood and felt by audiences of all generations and nationalities.

Many of the supporters of this now classical system followed their frequently diverging ways. However, the basis of their work, its foundations, remained the same. I can compare them to the foundations of linguistics, in which the same rules apply in the writing of all great works of Russian literature, from Pushkin to the present. Stanislavskiy's basics were followed by Meyerkho'd, Vakhtangov, Zavadskiy and R. Simonov in the past and by the leading actors and directors of today's Soviet theater.

I had the opportunity to see works performed by the national Buryat Drama Theater imeni Kh. Khamsarayev, directed by young graduates of the Leningrad Theater Institute. Their creative use of Stanislavskiy's method gives a rich spiritual life to their productions. Thus, the play "My Poplar With a Red Scarf," based on Chingiz Aytmatov's novel, a modern setting without any traits identifying the nationality of the characters, turned out to be by far more national and original than, shall we say, the universally familiar dances and songs of folk outfits, consistent with a vague yet already traditional forms applicable in all cases and to virtually all nations.

I have seen many theater performances of varying quality by various nations and based on different cultures. I dare to claim that the theater trade to which in his time Stanislavskiy opposed true creativity is, alas, still alive both in our country and elsewhere. I see again and again that wherever this trade blossoms one finds nothing original and individual and, mandatorily, nothing national. Those actors who practice their artistic trade resort to a kind of conventions which remind us of the flag signalling at sea. However perfect this system of signals may be, it is simply impossible to transmit with its help poetry and artistic prose with their most delicate shades of unique human thoughts and feelings.

An art deprived of its profound national features is depressingly monotonous and boring. The efforts of some theater workers to surmount this monotony by mechanically borrowing superficial means used by a Western or any other theater could hardly be successful. Naturally, the national theater should be interested in all accomplishments of modern culture both in our country and abroad. Such achievements, however, must be perceived from the viewpoint of our own national culture.

It would be pertinent at this point to recall that no nation is too small to make a contribution to the treasury of world culture. The theater practices of the peoples of the Soviet Union, including the Estonians, offer abundant proof of the accuracy of this statement.

The communist party and the Soviet government have always pursued a deeply thought-out policy in the field of culture, thoroughly tested with the help of Marxist-Leninist theory, and shown an attentive attitude toward the traditions of national art. Nevertheless, we sometimes come across some annoying problems in some areas.

One of them is a kind of parochialism in art, in the course of which some managers lose all feeling of objectivity for the sake of the fame and prestige of their artistic collective. In frequent cases turnover of creative cadres in the theater -- directors, painters, conductors, choreographers and choir masters -- is due essentially to the efforts of some officials to create a cult of local national "stars." If such are unavailable, they are imported from other towns.

Provincial vanity is also manifested in the fact that, one after the other, operatic theaters assume officially or unofficially the title of "grand" (the Bolshoy Theater in Moscow, therefore, may soon have to be renamed "Super-bolshoy" or "Grandest Bolshoy"). Hardly any thought is given to the fact that the Bolshoy Theater is an international concept of the Emblem of Quality in art and has nothing to do with the size of its premises or personnel. The renaming of local theaters and ascribing to them the title of "academic," unfortunately, is sometimes inconsistent with their actual creative accomplishments.

As we know, a kilometer, a second or a kilogram are measurements identical in all republics, oblasts and cities, regardless of national and regional differences. No one has lighter kilograms or shorter kilometers. In the field of culture in our country, alas, we still come across local yardsticks which are not always objective or related to great and true culture. In the case of small nations this is a very alarming symptom, for in such cases the final word rests with the local "patronizing" officials. The situation is worsened by the shortcomings in professional and objective local criticism. Although all party and government decrees on matters of culture and the arts emphasize that criticism must be professional and objective, there is a scarcity of professional critics even in the capitals of union republics, not to mention other cities.

We have many people with diplomas in theater studies, but few who can provide assessments and defend their viewpoints with proper arguments and objectivity. Only those who have used all available opportunities to see the best Soviet and foreign performances can judge of the qualities of local theaters, on the basis of solid criteria. Most of our critics, however, obtain materials needed for making comparisons by correspondence, or else merely judge the performances of local and visiting theaters. As a result, in frequent cases professional theaters are judged by nonprofessional critics.

Professionalism means assessing the work on the basis of strictly objective ideological and artistic criteria in theatrical expertise. Practical criticism also presumes the practical, the self-critical approach of the theater worker toward his art. Therefore, theater culture is a synthesis of direct artistic creativity and its objective scientific study in such a way that both theater workers and critics are equally responsible for its standards.

At this point let me point out the special role of theater experts in the Russian Federation -- Muscovites and Leningraders -- who contributed to the widespread fame enjoyed by the Georgian scenic art, the Latvian Artistic Theater imeni Ya. Raynis, the Panevezhe theater in Lithuania and the Vanemuyne, which I have been managing for more than 40 years.

I remember that after the premiere of "Coriolanus," which I directed in 1964, our local newspaper published an article the author of which demolished the performance and called for a complete change of the theater's management. The Moscow critics proved to be far more sympathetic in the all-union and the republic press, and 3 years later I was awarded the USSR State Prize for staging a number of plays, including that one. Our "Human Tragedy" by the Hungarian playwright M. Madacz remained almost unnoticed by the Estonian theater experts, but was highly rated in Moscow and Leningrad and in Hungary itself. Unfortunately, the opposite occurs as well, when local critics unjustifiably enthuse about patently weak plays.

Naturally, all of us have the right to a personal opinion about one type of directing or another. However, we have the right to demand of those whose articles are published in the periodical press and are addressed to the reader at large to display the highest possible professionalism and awareness of their special responsibility for what they print.

In addressing what I consider to be just criticism to our critics' "workshop" we must in no case forget that the atmosphere in which the critical, and not the carping, analysis of one staging or another largely depends on the practitioners of the art of the theater: directors, actors and playwrights. Let us be frank. In many cases the critics are subjected to direct or indirect pressure on the part of the theater "master." Sometimes an honest and objective reviewer is almost "silenced" if his words conflict with what a theater worker, who rests on past glories, would like to hear. Recently a theatrical performance was delayed until a critic known to the administration had been demonstratively escorted out. On a previous occasion that critic had allowed himself to voice a few very correct wishes concerning a performance in an otherwise positive review.

The purpose of an objective and ideologically sharp criticism is to play an invaluable role in not only the development of a dramatic theater but in the mass arts, such as, for example, variety shows and the invariably popular operettas. Quite frequently the opinion is voiced to the effect that the operetta is the most popular and most democratic theater genre. Ignored in this case is the fact that for ages on end the operetta has been above all a commercialized type of art oriented toward the dissemination of the most common and most frequently undeveloped and undemanding tastes.

This should not be interpreted in the sense that I am against operettas. I know that both Stanislavskiy and Nemirovich-Danchenko valued them for their cheerfulness, gayety and wit, qualities which they should retain in Soviet art as well. However, let us remember that it is precisely in this genre, more than in any other, that the threat of vulgarity is present. Operettas always demand a refined taste on the part of the director and all performers.

The words "nationality" and "democracy" are frequently used when the merits of variety shows are discussed. Yet the practical experience of our Vanemuine concert hall proves that concerts by even the most popular vocal and instrumental groups do not exceed ten performances, whereas our theater's repertory includes plays which we stage 100 to 150 times.

The purpose of all genres of art in our country -- both "serious" and "entertaining" -- is to educate the new man, organically supplementing one another. Yet sometimes pop shows crowd out all others. For example, Tallin has long needed a large and modern opera building. Its construction would finally enable the Estonia Theater to work in premises consistent with its needs. Furthermore, this would resolve the problem of performances in Tallin by guest theater and opera groups from elsewhere in the country.

Instead, however, a palace of culture and sports, with a huge hall for 4,000 people, was built in the Estonian capital. The stage of this palace is suitable for the performance of neither plays nor operas. It is suitable only for pop concerts, so that all the culture as proclaimed in the name of this grandiose and expensive building is reduced to variety shows. Meanwhile the Tallin opera and ballet are working under restrained conditions. The Puppet Theater faces the same problems, while for the past 20 years the Estonian Youth Theater has had no permanent premises of its own.

We frequently repeat Lenin's thought that art belongs to the people. Usually, however, we omit the second part of this famous concept, which states that the people's masses must be educated above all to accept this art and that suitable conditions to this purpose must be provided. It seems to me that the theater plays a particular role in the responsible matter of artistic education, for it synthesizes many forms of art: literature, music, painting, dance, mime, and words. As was pointed out at the international conference recently held by UNESCO in Paris, in our television century the theater alone retains a direct contact between the artist and the audience. Although this evaluation may be somewhat exaggerated, it contains a great deal of truth.

The truly nationwide love of the theater entrusts us with great obligations. We try to stage for the Soviet people the realistic and highly professional representation of contemporary reality as reflected in their own thoughts. The June CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized that as the cultural standards of the people rise the impact of art on the people's minds increases. "This also enhances the possibilities of art actively to interfere in social life. This tremendously increases the responsibility of the workers in the arts so that this powerful weapon in their hands may serve the cause of the people, the cause of communism," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said at the plenum. Such precisely is the great purpose of Soviet realistic art.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

INTERVENTION SYNDROME AND LESSONS OF HISTORY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 96-102

[Article by Doctors of Historical Sciences V. Mal'kov and B. Marushkin]

[Text] The policy of intervention, which is a customary weapon of the exploiting classes in the struggle for preserving and expanding their rule, is as old as the world. It has been frequently used in the past, and plays today an important role in the foreign policy arsenal of imperialism. The example of Grenada is universally familiar.

As early as the end of the 19th century, the policy of armed invasions has been inseparably linked to the thoroughly false doctrine of the "civilizing mission" of American capitalism which allegedly rescues the peoples from disturbances, internal discord and economic stagnation. The lessons of history and their comparison with the actions and rhetoric of the present Reagan administration provide a very clear picture of the continuity of the aggressive and hypocritical course of contemporary American imperialism.

Following are previously unpublished letters by one of the inspirers and direct organizers of the armed intervention by the United States against Soviet Russia: Robert Lansing, U.S. secretary of state from 1915 to 1920. Although many works have been written about the intervention against the Soviet Union and the collapse of this foreign invasion, and the role which the United States played in it is essentially well known, the question of the reasons and plans which guided the decision of the ruling circles in the United States to interfere in "Russian affairs" remains open, the more so since bourgeois historians have written mountains of words to justify the intervention by the United States in our country's Far East and North in 1918-1922. The three letters are quite interesting also in the context of the times when they were written and in the present, when we are aware of the outcome of actions which left a trace of blood and an indelible stain of shame on the reputation of the United States. Unquestionably, they shed additional light on this shameful event in American history.

Let us take a minute to visualize the circumstances which preceded America's decision to throw its soldiers against Soviet Russia. This took place at a time when the two countries had reached different phases in their development. Having just emerged from the revolution, the Soviet republic was forced to defend itself against domestic and foreign reaction and build its statehood in

conditions of war, blockade and economic dislocation. The United States had existed as a country for over a century and its socioeconomic system had been offered a unique opportunity for an almost unhindered and "clean" development, which had given American imperialism a position of leadership in the Western world weakened as a result of World War One. What had frightened the rich, self-confident and self-satisfied capitalist America, what had forced it to tense all its muscles in preparing for a military intervention?

As the published letters clearly prove, the idea of intervention arose not as a reaction to an imaginary "aggressiveness of the Soviet regime" toward the outside world and not in connection to the imaginary threat of "export of the revolution" by the bolsheviks or an upset in the military strategic ratio of forces as a result of Russia's withdrawal from the war as official American propaganda claimed. In no way did the new Russia threaten the national interests of the United States. To the contrary, the Soviet government proclaimed from the very beginning its intention to maintain and develop good neighborly relations with all countries, the United States above all. What had caused the irreconcilable enmity of the U.S. bourgeoisie was the Soviet overthrow of the institution of private ownership, sacred to the capitalists, and the right to exploit other people's labor and to plunder the national resources of foreign countries. Naturally, the essence of the matter was the class rejection of the social foundations of the new system.

Lansing had expressed his attitude toward the events taking place in Russia as early as December 1917 with such extreme clarity as to leave no doubt regarding the position held by capitalist and petit bourgeois America. He wrote that "the correct policy of any government which believes in the political institutions as they presently exist and which bases its actions on feelings of national unity and recognizes private property is to keep these dangerous idealists isolated and maintain no direct relations whatsoever with them..." ("War Memoirs of Robert Lansing." New York, 1935, p 340).

As we well know, these "dangerous idealists" were not left alone and even not in a state of "isolation." Initially, however, American diplomacy relied on fanning bourgeois nationalism and the separatist aspirations of a variety of local reactionary cliques and self-appointed parliaments and rulers. On 12 December 1917 Lansing wrote that any movement by the opposition in Russia "should be supported even if its chances of success are few." In his 10 May 1918 message to U.S. President Wilson Lansing returned to the topic of dismembering Russia. Relying on the success of the centrifugal counterrevolutionary forces, the secretary of state still believed that the methods of covert intervention were preferable to the open military intervention on the side of these forces (see "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. The Lansing Papers, 1914-1920." Washington, 1940, pp 128, 345). However, like Wilson, he never pitted the one against the other.

The version making the rounds in bourgeois works of history is that until mid-July 1918 the Wilson administration desperately resisted the pressure of its British and French allies, who were demanding its agreement for a joint intervention, and that it was forced to yield subsequently under the pressure of accidental circumstances. Lansing's 28 May 1918 letter clearly indicates that as early as April-May of that same year intensive consultations were

taking place in Washington on planning and preparing for direct American intervention. However, heeding Wilson's wish to seem like a supporter of the principle of national sovereignty, the consultations were conducted in deep secrecy, behind tightly closed doors. Meanwhile, in order to conceal his objectives, in his public addresses to "the Russian people," the President expatiated on his sympathy for them and loyalty to the idea of nonintervention.

Hesitations and doubts as to the success of the "expedition" to Siberia, naturally, let themselves be felt: the American government was well informed of the mood of the people of Russia and the way they reacted to the interventionists. However, Wilson or Lansing were not opposed in the least to those who advocated immediate interference in "Russian affairs" and the overthrow of the Soviet system by force. This is clearly seen from Lansing's 15 August 1918 letter which was mailed literally on the eve of the landing of American expeditionary forces in Vladivostok, once all doubts had been cast aside, a decision had been made and the implementation of the plan for joint American-Japanese intervention had begun. Here as well we cannot agree in the least with the noted American historian George Kennan (nephew of Lansing's correspondent) who wrote in the book "The Decision to Intervene" that American sources have no answer to the question of the objectives of the operation (G. Kennan. "Soviet-American Relations. 1917-1920. The Decision to Intervene." London, 1958, p 403). Assisting the evacuation of the Czechoslovak corps from Siberia and protecting warehouses and transportation arteries were mainly a pretext. In the case of a favorable outcome of the operation, Washington's plans called for extending U.S. and Japanese military presence to Eastern and Western Siberia, active participation in strangling the Russian revolution and the dismembering of Russia. No expansion of the intervention took place but, as Lansing was forced to admit (see his 2 February 1920 letter), this was the result of reasons independent of the U.S. government. The routing of the counterrevolutionary and interventionist forces brought to an infamous end this adventure launched by international imperialism against the first socialist state.

In a confidential letter dated 2 February 1920, Lansing assessed the results of the American intervention "in Russian affairs," sadly noting that "The development of events in Siberia (related to the American armed intervention -- the authors) took an entirely unexpected turn and failed to justify the hopes of those who truly wanted for the Russians nothing but good, hopes we nurtured in 1918 and in the realization of which we believed firmly." We already mentioned the hopes (of dismembering Russia) shared by Lansing and those he represented, on the eve of the intervention. Let us note at this point that the U.S. armed invasion (as well as that of other capitalist countries) of Russia was a totally unprovoked, perfidious and exceptionally hostile act. It not only factually cancelled a long period of good neighborly relations (let us recall that Russia had taken a supportive position toward the United States on two critical events in American history: the War of Independence and the Civil War), but also the slogans under which the Americans had fought toward the end of the 18th century: the right of nations to freedom and to changing a form of government they found unsatisfactory.

"The decision to intervene" essentially meant that Washington was rejecting the fundamental principles proclaimed by the October Revolution in the Decree

on Peace: the right of nations to peace, social justice and self-determination. In interpreting one of the stipulations of the Decree on Peace, V. I. Lenin said that "We reject all stipulations related to plunder and violence, but welcome all stipulations on good neighborly and economic agreements, and cannot reject these" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete collected Works], vol 35, p 20). Such was, from the very beginning, the approach taken by the land of the soviets to problems of relations with the outside world.

In an effort to normalize relations with the United States, on 14 May 1918 the Soviet government submitted to the American government a detailed plan for the development of economic relations between the two countries. On 5 August of the same year the Soviet government again told the U.S. representative that it wanted to live in peace with the United States. These good-will gestures were left unanswered. We know now that it was precisely at that time that secret discussions were under way in Washington on the details of the intervention and that feverish preparations were being made for the Vladivostok landing.

In an effort to limit the impact of Lenin's foreign policy program on world public opinion, President Wilson announced on 8 January 1918 his "14 points" for the postwar structure of the world. He also found it necessary to mention the principle of self-determination. Despite such declarations, however, American forces were sent overseas to prevent the working people of revolutionary Russia to apply this principle. Furthermore, this action was illegal not only from the point of view of international law but of the American Constitution as well. Characteristically, in his 2 February 1920 letter Lansing admits that "The government had no legal right to support some against others (in other words to support the counterrevolution against the power of the working people -- the authors) without congressional sanction." This made the military adventure launched against Soviet Russia a kind of "model" of American-style interventionism, an example of cynical violation of legal norms in respect to other peoples and countries, the application of a double standard in assessing "one's own" and "someone else's" foreign policy and a case of hypocritical moralizing on the matter of the "historical obligation" of the United States.

Already then, in order to justify the hostility of the ruling circles in the West to the socialist revolution in Russia, bourgeois propaganda had presented its policy of anti-Soviet intervention as a "crusade" for a fictitious "restoration of democracy." Actually, this was and remains nothing but a smokescreen concealing naked banditry. Let us cite as proof of this fact the testimony of General Graves, a participant in the operation for "bringing democracy" to Russia. The American Expeditionary Corps in Siberia, he wrote, was "hated by more than 90 percent of its population," and the cruelties it committed will be "still remembered and retold by the Russian people 50 years hence" (V. Graves, "Amerikanskaya Avantiyura v Sibiri" [The American Adventure in Siberia]. Moscow, 1932, pp 238, 242). Equally indicative is the fact that during the civil war in Russia the "Western democracies" supported not the petit bourgeois democrats, who had appealed to them, but the extreme-right reactionaries, such as Admiral Kolchak, on whom they counted most, as Lansing acknowledges in the letters which follow. As a result, Lenin emphasized, "The Constituent Assembly was replaced by Kolchak's dictatorship, which was the most extreme and worse than any tsarist dictatorship" (op. cit., vol 39,

p 127). This support of a dictator "for the sake of defending" (in words) democracy became the permanent alogism of 20th century American foreign policy, widening the gap between officially proclaimed ideology and actual political course relying on terrorist, corrupt, reactionary and, finally, purely fascist regimes.

The effort to turn the wheel of history back by the force of arms failed ignominiously. The revolution proved its viability and ability to defend itself. As Lansing wrote, "We organized supplies to Kolchak and hoped that he would raise a Russian army which would replace the withdrawing Czechoslovaks. The hope was futile. The Russians firmly refused to rally around him. I do not know why."

Shammed perplexity. There was no puzzlement. The peoples of Russia were on the side of the revolution and not the counterrevolution.

By defeating the domestic counterrevolution and the foreign intervention and establishing a durable and united state the peoples of our country gave a very instructive lesson to all amateurs at interfering in someone else's affairs.

It was said of the Bourbon kings that they never forgot or learned anything. In all likelihood, the same variety of historical blindness struck the makers of American foreign policy as well. According to the American Brookings Institution, between 1946 and 1975 alone the United States used its armed forces on 215 occasions in pursuit of its foreign-policy and military-strategic objectives, repeatedly resorting to the threat to use nuclear weapons. This might seem quite sufficient. However, not a single day is lost without hearing menacing shouts and curses coming out of Washington against the revolutionary forces of our time. "On the historical level, one could say that we have found the sources of the greatest threat to international peace today -- the Marxist-Leninist movement," has said A. Haig, former U.S. secretary of state. President Reagan's June 1982 speech to the British Parliament strikingly reminded of the notorious speech delivered by Churchill in Fulton, at which he called for a "crusade" against communism and social progress. Such "fundamental" statements are accompanied by interventionist actions. The United States is increasing its interference in the domestic affairs of the socialist countries in an effort to "dismantle socialism." It is threatening the young countries, which have taken the path of building a new society, with open intervention, while at the same time encouraging and supporting the most reactionary and inhuman regimes throughout the world. The syndrome of interventionism leads to forgetting the lessons of history and befores the mind.

The USSR Supreme Soviet 29 December 1983 decree "On the International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet State" reads that "The American military is sowing death and destruction and violating the sovereignty and independence of other countries. Like the war in Vietnam, the aggression committed against Grenada and its illegal occupation will become a page of shame in U.S. history. Washington's great-power policy in Central America, where an undeclared war is being waged on Nicaragua, the threats made against the Republic of Cuba, the American and Israeli occupation of Lebanon and the open support of South African aggression against Angola and other African countries trigger anger and indignation. In violation of the UN Charter, the

imperialist states are claiming the right to throw their weight about in foreign lands, to control the natural resources of other countries and to impose their will on the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Naturally, the interference strategy (in its various aspects) is aimed mainly at the USSR and the other socialist countries. The 1949 American plan for waging war on the USSR (the Dropshot Plan) called for making use of bourgeois nationalism in the European socialist countries in order "seriously to weaken the Soviet bloc" ("Dropshot. The United States Plan for War With the Soviet Union in 1957." Edited by A. Brown. New York, 1978, p 20). In 1953 and 1956 the U.S. intelligence services did everything possible to energize antisocialist elements in the GDR and Hungary. The plan's failure did not weaken Washington's aspirations to interfere in the affairs of foreign countries.

The aggressive and bloody war which American imperialism waged against the Vietnamese people was the largest intervention act in U.S. history. The efforts to block the path of communist ideas with the help of an expeditionary corps half a million strong and supplied with the latest equipment and using the most barbaric methods of military operations ended with Washington's total failure.

The fraternal aid of the socialist commonwealth defeated the plans for a counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Washington's anti Polish activities, aimed at destabilizing the situation in that socialist country failed as well. Cuba has been the target of subversive attacks for many years. Savage threats are combined with pharisaic considerations on the "viciousness of socialism" in terms of the Latin American countries and its incompatibility with "Western civilization."

The 28 September 1983 declaration by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, provides a clear assessment of the course of the Reagan administration in foreign affairs: "The world is well familiar with the price of this kind of moralizing. In Vietnam morality, as understood by Washington's leaders, was instilled with the help of napalm and toxic chemicals. In Lebanon it is hammered in with naval gunfire. In El Salvador it is applied through genocide. The list of such crimes could be extended. Therefore, what we can say on the subject of the moral side of U.S. politics is that what history recalls also applies to the present."

Erroneous aspirations are the main symptom of adventurism. Today, when the "cost of intervention" has risen catastrophically, it would be worth recalling Lansing's summation of the American "Siberian fiasco:" "We simply did everything we could." The results are known.

The originals of the documents which follow are part of the files of George Kennan, the noted American bourgeois scientist and public figure (U.S. Library of Congress).

The Secretary of State
Washington, 28 May 1918

Please stamp "Personal"
on all correspondence

My dear Mr. Kennan:

I thank you for your letter of the 26th and the attachments. I read it with special interest, for its author is the greatest authority on Russia in America. I was pleased to learn that your reaction to the confused situation which has developed is quite similar to mine although, quite naturally, I am somewhat uncertain as to my own views, for I have had no time to study the question as I would have liked to.

I am not entirely certain as to the wisdom of the idea of an intervention in Siberia, but can assure you that the question is currently being studied quite thoroughly both from the political side and the point of view of purely technical difficulties related to the transportation of the troops which, bearing in mind the shortage of ships in the Pacific, would be quite severe.

Your letter offers such a precise analysis of the meaning of current events and presents your views with such exhausting clarity that I shall pass it on to the president without fail.

Please feel free to share with me on all occasions your views on international affairs, for which I shall always be thankful.

My best regards to you and Mrs. Kennan.

Yours devoted, Robert Lansing¹

To Georges Kennan, esq.
1038 Fifth Avenue
New York

The Secretary of State
Washington
15 August 1918

My dear Mr. Kennan:

I greatly appreciate your letters of 6 and 9 August which I read after my return from Henderson Harbor last Monday.

I consider your correspondence with Mr. Price exceptionally interesting and I am sincerely happy that you approve of the policy which our government has decided to follow in cooperating with the Japanese for the sake of helping the Czechoslovaks in Siberia. I hope that your prediction that our troops will be received warmly will be fulfilled.

My best wishes to you and Mrs. Kennan and, please believe me, I hope that you will not deprive me of your advice concerning Russian affairs in the future.

Your devoted Robert Lansing²

To George Kennan, esq.
Broadwater
Baddeck, Victoria County
Nova Scotia

The Secretary of State
Washington
2 February 1920

Personal and confidential

Dear Mr. Kennan:

I am always glad to receive any of your letters with an analysis of the Russian situation, for I well know your exceptional familiarity with this question and your interest in the well-being of the Russian people. Your views on this question have always been very valuable to me.

The development of events in Siberia has taken an entirely unexpected turn and has failed to justify the hopes of those who sincerely wished the Russian people nothing but well, as well the hopes we had in 1918 and in the fulfillment of which we believed firmly.

You must take into consideration the fact that at the time the American forces were sent to Siberia we faced the serious problem of how to ensure sending to France every single person who could be trained and equipped to fulfill his military duty. The recalling of a large number of military units for the sake of creating expeditionary forces in Siberia met with the opposition of the allies, who believed that the fate of the war will be decided on the Western Front and that everything should be subordinated to securing numerical superiority in northern France. Japan wanted to send to Siberia a force sufficient to secure the use of the railroad to Irkutsk and thus to provide the necessary supplies to the Czechoslovaks who were moving eastward. Its objective was also to prevent the arming of German and Austrian prisoners of war and the seizure of the railroad to the east by them.

We also felt that to allow the Japanese to act alone would mean to trigger dislike among the population and encourage all the various groups to join forces against them. Under these circumstances the Supreme Command agreed to send 10,000 American troops to Siberia for joint actions with the Japanese with a view to securing the unobstructed use of the railroad for the retreat of the Czechoslovaks.

You must take into consideration that we were not in a state of war with Russia, for which reason we could not fight any of the groups. The government had no legal right whatsoever to support some against others without congressional consent. Therefore, in order to do it we had to secure its agreement to declare war. Obviously, you were aware at that time of the feelings in Congress, which were running high against sending American troops to Siberia. There could not even be a question of making it agree to a declaration of war and allowing us to send an army adequate to ensure an advance in Western Siberia. This could not be done.

For a while the government was literally torn by demands coming from all sides to bring home the forces already in Siberia, for the reason that Kolchak was keeping the Czechoslovak forces with him to fight on his side, for which reason he did not let them go to Vladivostok to be shipped home. Unfortunately, it appears that these charges were accurate and that the growing discontent of the Czechoslovaks was manifested in loss of spirit and rebellious behavior.

We organized the supplying of Kolchak and hoped that he would raise a Russian army which would replace the departing Czechoslovaks. It was a vain hope. The Russians firmly refused to rally around him. The Russians are either short of patriotism or else they mistrust Kolchak or the members of his government. In any case, the movement he represented collapsed the moment the Czechoslovaks refused to fight on his side. Under those circumstances, our government had no option but to recall its troops from Siberia the moment the expedition would be completed. This meant withdrawing the Czechoslovaks and our railroad and medical personnel to Vladivostok.

At this point I shall not dwell on the expediency of sending a large army to Western Siberia in 1918, for this would have been impossible for several reasons. First, it would have required a declaration of war and congressional appropriations, which we could not have achieved. Second, the military leadership in the United States and all of its allies opposed any significant removal of troops, transport facilities and military materiel from the Western Front. They were unanimous on this point.

Third, the Japanese flatly refused to send troops beyond Irkutsk, even for the sake of protecting the railroad. Therefore, they could not be relied on in terms of interaction in Western Siberia.

Fourth, public opinion in the United States would have opposed the sending of additional contingents of American forces to Siberia and would have supported Congress in its efforts to prevent this.

This is a brief description of the problems and difficulties our government would have faced. My sole objective is for you to know that the use of large and active American army forces in Siberia was prevented not by inadequate support of this idea but the existing circumstances which made pursuit of this course simply impossible. Our hands and feet were tied by circumstances.

Please consider this letter confidential, for I have described my views on the matter more frankly than I usually do. I decided to do so, so that you would not deliberately misrepresent the government's policy if you were given the complete information. We simply did everything we could in an impossibly difficult situation which was the result of Kolchak's inability to raise a sufficiently strong Russian (White Guard -- the authors) army to replace the Czechoslovaks.

Warmest regards to you and Mrs. Kennan,

Sincerely yours, Robert Lansing³.

P.S. I am sending you under separate cover the memorandum on the bolshevik movement in Russia you requested.

To George Kennan
1038 Fifth Avenue
New York City

FOOTNOTES

1. Library of Congress. George Kennan Papers. Box 4. George Kennan's book "The Decision to Intervene" includes only an excerpt of this letter (see G. Kennan. "Soviet-American Relations. 1917-1920. The Decision to Intervene." London, 1958, p 359). The author omits the part in which the secretary of state described the intervention as an essentially predetermined matter.
2. Library of Congress. George Kennan Papers. Box 4.
3. Idem.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

SYSTEM OF VIOLENCE AND WARS; THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE EYES OF AN
AMERICAN JOURNALIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 103-112

[Article by Mike Davidow]

[Text] The name of Mike Davidow, the Moscow correspondent for the DAILY WORLD, a veteran of the U.S. communist and worker movements, is well-known to the Soviet and foreign readers. Over many years of work, this progressive American journalist has published a number of articles and correspondences. He is the author of a number of books on the Soviet Union, such as "City Without Crisis," "Why Johnny Can't While Ivan Can Read," "Moscow Diary," "Democracy in Fact and Democracy in Words," and others, in which the life and work of the Soviet people are described. The present article was written especially for this journal.

In our days the struggle for socialism and for the progress of mankind is inseparably related to protecting the world from the threat of nuclear catastrophe, for this is the first time in its history that the world faces the alternative of having or not having a civilization. The very logic of international developments forces millions of people on earth increasingly to realize that the source of the threat to civilization comes from the most aggressive imperialist circles, American above all, whereas the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are a reliable bulwark of peace, progress and security of the nations.

It is not by accident, therefore, that the anger and indignation of world public, including the broad strata in the United States, are turned above all against the course taken by the Reagan administration. The politicians in power in Washington are not simply nuclear maniacs. They are also the representatives of the most militant circles of a ruling class which has outlived its century and is making desperate attempts to turn the clock of history back. In its imperialist stage capitalism has brought mankind tremendous casualties, destruction and suffering. During World Wars I and II alone and the numerous aggressive "local" or "small" wars which were fought after them dozens of millions of people have died. More than ever before today the ruling circles in the imperialist countries have concentrated in their hands huge means for mass destruction, which can cause mankind incalculable troubles and privations and threaten its existence. It is frightening even to think of how greater this threat would have been to the peoples

on earth, including the United States, had the USSR failed to achieve military parity and the possibility of restraining the aggressive aspirations of the nuclear maniacs.

Toward the end of the 1940s and beginning of the 1950s Presidents Truman and Eisenhower discussed, as became known from declassified Pentagon documents, a report by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which called for "unleashing a preventive war against the Soviet Union." According to the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, Eisenhower subsequently approved plans for dealing a "preventive strike at Russia." A roughly similar logic prevails in the thoughts and behavior of today's supporters of a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war and the nuclear arms race.

What kind of a system is this in which influential positions may be held by people who gamble with the very existence of mankind? In his classic work on imperialism, V. I. Lenin exhaustively described such a system which can lead the world to its doom. Its distorted features were manifested quite clearly in the course of the slaughter organized by the imperialist powers in World War I. Lenin proved that imperialism is the final stage of capitalism, the stage of its definitive decay. More than any other, Lenin's definition applies to the United States of today, where this process is developing in a particularly acute form. Only a society thoroughly stricken with this ill could bring up leaders similar to those who are currently directing or are closely affiliated with U.S. policy.

For example, Edward Teller, the "father" of the hydrogen bomb, not only helps push mankind to the precipice of nuclear catastrophe but is personally getting richer from the production of weapons for the mass destruction of people. The NEW YORK TIMES informed its readers that he has invested heavily in the Helionetics Company, which "can show profits" by, among other things, providing power systems for the Pershing II missiles. This company has distributed its shares worth millions of dollars among leading scientific and military specialists and other individuals with close ties to the Reagan administration. The newspaper pointed out that Teller has "long acted as a leading advocate of the use of space technology in the development of an antimissile defense system. He has held several face-to-face meetings with Reagan to discuss such problems." Teller is one of the participants in the so-called "brain trust" which developed the plan for "space wars" formulated by President Reagan.

Capitalism, which is outliving its century, is a system the dominating positions in which are held by a class so deeply concerned with extracting profits and protecting its own privileges as to be deeply indifferent to the health of the people and the protection of the environment.

One of the most serious problems triggered by industrial development and chemization is the threat to man and nature should the government and society fail to show their readiness sensibly to approach the solution of problems if profits are put above the interests of the people. Naturally, environmental pollution cannot be classified among the political phenomena of our time. However, the answer to the question of how ecological problems have been and

are being resolved and of the degree of pollution of the environment is most directly related to political factors and the social system. For decades the U.S. monopolies have not only predatorily exploited the country's tremendous natural resources but have literally poisoned our air and water. Norman Cousins, the widely known editor and publicist, wrote in the Encyclopedic Almanac for 1970, published by THE NEW YORK TIMES, that "every single large river in the United States is seriously polluted. The bottom of even small rivers and streams is lined with a thick layer of silt and algae as a result of the fact that industrial enterprises are freely discarding in them their toxic waste which the current carries away from the site of the crime."

In citing this scandalous proof of scorn for the health and well-being of the population, the author impartially notes that the solution of problems related to environmental protection is hindered by the "usual obstacles--political inertia and unwillingness on the part of private industry, including public utilities, to make major capital investments in the interests of society, which could trigger the adverse reaction of their stockholders." In simple terms, the companies wash their hands of the people, essentially concerned with their profits.

Ten years later, TIME magazine published an article on the same topic, entitled "The Poisoning of America." What had changed during that period? The picture had become even darker. Private industry, the powerful chemical corporations in particular, the magazine noted, releases "more than 77 billion pounds of dangerous waste every year and only 10 percent of this amount is safe." Douglas (Costl), at that time head of the government's Environmental Protection Agency, noted that "we did not realize that each barrel buried in the ground was a delayed-action bomb which was bound to explode eventually."

A close tie exists between the "delayed-action bomb" and today's threat of nuclear destruction of the people and the environment. The reason in both cases is the nature of the system. It is entirely natural that with the ascension to power of the Reagan administration, which represents the most aggressive forces of the military-industrial complex, along with a drastically increased danger of nuclear war, a totally free hand was given to the "poisoners of America." The distinguishing feature of the groups of the ruling class which are now in power is that they represent the most extreme anti-people's and antihumane views of the defenders of contemporary capitalism. It is natural, therefore, that abrogating the already modest laws which had been passed under the pressure of the public somehow to restrict the "poisoning of America" became one of the main objectives of the administration. For a start the Environmental Protection Agency was deprived of all of its already maimed rights. Until recently James Watt headed the Department of the Interior, to which it is subordinated. He was so close to the main poisoners and polluters of America that the CHICAGO SUN-TIMES openly wrote that his appointment to that position "is the same as appointing Dracula to manage a blood bank."

Actually, Watt did not conceal his views. Asked in a Congressional hearing what he considered to be his task in the protection of environmental resources, this zealously religious person mockingly said: "I do not know the

number of future generations on which we could count until the Second Coming." Without any pangs of conscience Watt left to the mercy of the monopolies and public utility enterprises our forests, rivers, and mineral resources and even the air we breathe. This led to an even greater predatory plunder of natural resources and environmental pollution on such a scandalous scale that unless an end is put to such a debauch the consequences will be simply catastrophic.

Reagan himself is the inspirer of the offensive mounted against even the most modest restrictions imposed on the poisoning monopolies. The WALL STREET JOURNAL, the organ of big business, wrote in an article entitled "The President Tries Decisively To Weaken the Law on Protecting the Purity of the Water," that the Environmental Protection Agency is calling on Congress to abolish most of the regulations demanding the treatment of chemical waste. Among those which Reagan tries to abolish are "stipulations which include most of the national standards according to which companies must chemically process industrial waters before dumping them into the public sewer systems."

Many years ago Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels pointed out that there is something rotten in the very foundations of a system in which the pace at which criminality spreads outstrips the growth of the population. What could be said therefore about a social system in which the rate at which crime is outstripping the population increased by a factor of 11? Such was precisely the ratio, according to the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, between 1960 and 1968. The situation since then has not only not changed for the better but has worsened further.

The atmosphere of fear which prevails in the United States may be judged by a big ad signed by Ira Littman, chairman of the administrative council of the Guardsmark Corporation, in the NEW YORK TIMES. "The likelihood that you will be robbed has doubled over the past 10 years," this initiative-minded businessman announced in advertising his wares--locks and firearms. Speaking in the Senate, Edward Kennedy said that "a person born in urban America today stands a greater chance of being killed than those who saw combat in World War II."

The savage and mass nature of crime is having a fatal influence on the life of the U.S. population. After dark the life of tens of millions of Americans is restricted to their homes. The elderly--the main victims of the criminals--are exposed to danger whenever they go shopping.

Fear has become an inseparable feature of U.S. life, profoundly affecting the nature of the country's social and cultural life. This means fear of a possible nuclear war, loss of job, and possibility of losing one's relatives or home; fear triggered by the steadily rising cost of medical services and fear of the future. All of these and other fears give a qualitatively new nature to the threat to which the broad masses of ordinary Americans have always been subject within the "free enterprise" system. Life under the conditions of such a growing fear causes spiritual and emotional, not to mention material, harm to the people, which is difficult to express in figures.

Clearly, many people who are familiar only with the conditions of total safety of life in a socialist country, although some of them may be somewhat

blinded by the glitter of "abundance" in the United States, may find it difficult to realize what it means to live under the pressure of a constant feeling of fear and insecurity. The situation in the United States cannot be understood without this, a circumstance marked by a crisis of faith, shifting moods, outbreaks of disappointment, periodical rebellions in the black ghettos and a tension which hangs over the American cities like storm clouds.

The big city is one of the distinguishing features of contemporary civilization. Obviously, hardly anything could more clearly prove the worsened quality of life in the United States under the conditions of monopoly capitalism than the crisis of the American cities. This crisis is not only comprehensively acknowledged by the "big business" press. It is even defended by some bourgeois ideologues as a necessary and inevitable phenomenon. This "defense" is actually the base of the "urban policy" pursued by the Reagan administration. As early as 1976 George Will, a right-wing columnist and one of the leading personalities in Reagan's "brain trust," proclaimed the concept which is now being implemented by the White House. In reference to the crisis which had afflicted New York, the leading center of American and world capitalism, Will wrote that "pursuit of a policy of acceptance on a selective basis of the death of an urban center may prove to be inevitably applicable to some of the old cities which find themselves in a similarly difficult position." He expressed his "philosophical credo" as follows: "The death of the cities or, in any case, the death of an urban area in the largest urban centers in the country appears today inevitable.... Death hovers over some parts of New York such as the depopulated ruins of the South Bronx and Brooklyn."

Clearly stating that it may be economically more expedient to accept the "death of the cities" rather than "wasting resources for their revival," Will bluntly proclaimed that "the way to restoring any kind of health in the cities may be for them to go through their 'Death Valley.' It could very well happen that an urban area may have to die so that the rest of the town may live." It is not hard for Americans, blacks and Latins above all, to guess which parts are doomed to death by Will.

Alan Cranston, a Democratic senator from California and one of the contenders for the Presidency in the forthcoming 1984 elections, described as follows his trip to the South Bronx at the National Convention of the Democratic Party in New York in 1976: "Building after building and district after district have been burned down and literally devastated. The area reminds one of a city subject to saturation bombing during a war. Nearly half a million people are still living in the South Bronx. Forty percent of them subsist on a variety of aid, 30 percent of those who can work are unemployed (today this percentage is much higher--the author), 20,000 are drug addicts and 9,500 are members of one criminal gang or another. They live in buildings unfit for human life, 20 percent of which are without running water and 50 percent of which are not heated for nearly half the year." Cranston concluded that "the South Bronx is a symbol of hopelessness on the part of the government and the lack of any interest shown by the private circles over many decades."

Incidentally, Reagan and, before him, Carter, in the course of their visits to the South Bronx, which were extensively covered by the press and the

television, solemnly promised to do something to correct this horrifying situation. The terrible picture painted by Cranston worsened even further after the Reagan administration undertook to implement a policy based on the principle of the "death of nations." According to the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, the implementation of the new 5-year American rearmament plan, drafted by the Pentagon, would cost the country almost \$2 trillion. Meanwhile, the creation of tolerable living conditions for tens of millions of Americans, who live in areas doomed to "death" from the viewpoint of the ruling circles, means a "waste of resources."

As organizer of councils of the unemployed in New York and, subsequently, the Working People's Alliance in the 1930s, during the "Great Depression," I perfectly remember the tremendous suffering of the people of the United States. At that time hundreds of thousands of Americans lived in pitiful temporary shacks on the edges of cities and abandoned land. The piles of such hovels were known as "Hoovervilles," named after President Hoover who tirelessly assured the American people that "prosperity is around the corner." Today, when unemployment in the United States is affecting almost 20 million people, President Reagan as well promises to "revive" economic activities.

The tragedy of unemployment has triggered a phenomenon described in the press as the generation of the "new poor." Who are these "new poor?" According to the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, they are "workers who have always been able to make their mortgage payments and had never considered themselves poor. Today they are unable to find jobs and are despairing." The reasons for this are substantial! The newspaper quotes results of studies conducted in 55 U.S. cities, in which the "new poor" are referred to as "people who have lost their jobs and are now sleeping under bridges in Tulsa (Oklahoma), spending the night in their cars on the highways around Houston, and losing their homes in Gary (Indiana)."

The reserve army of the unemployed, as Karl Marx pointed out in his time, is a phenomenon organically inherent in and needed by the capitalist system. The very growth of this "reserve army," however, has brought about qualitative changes. In their time leading economists and state officials had proclaimed 4 percent unemployment "tolerable." The figure was then raised to 6 percent. Now, when unemployment remains on the 10 percent level, a temporary increase in business activities in industry is presented by the Reagan administration as the "restoration of economic activities!"

More sober minds, including those of many major Wall Street experts, are seriously concerned. No single economic crisis (there have been more than enough of them) since "the Great Depression" of the 1930s has been described as a "depression." Instead, the word "decline" has been invariably used. Now, as Hobart Rowan, a WASHINGTON POST columnist wrote, "depression--this terrible word--is beginning to be mentioned with increasing frequency during serious discussions." "How long will the social fabric of America and the leading European countries be able to withstand the terrible tragedy of unemployment?" Rowan asked. In another article he pointed out that economists from the Brookings Institution and Wall Street were concerned at one point by the possibility of a \$100 billion budget deficit (the possibility of nearly

double that figure is becoming currently apparent--the author), and warned that unless it is sharply reduced "it would be difficult even to imagine the economic catastrophe which may befall America."

The drastic cuts made by the administration in funds for social needs has worsened the mass suffering. "Throughout the United States," the newspaper asserts, "municipal institutions are literally crowded by the growing number of 'new poor,' which come to them for aid.... The municipal employees in such cities say that the cuts in federal budget allocations and the decline in economic activities do not allow them to meet even one-half of the requirements of the needy for objects of prime necessity such as food and a roof over their heads."

The elimination of the social gains of the American working people has long been one of the main objectives of the most reactionary and aggressive circles of U.S. monopoly capital. After Reagan's arrival in the White House, a total offensive was mounted against these gains. Social benefits, which played the role of a buffer in softening the blows of cyclical crises, were significantly reduced during Reagan's presidency. Nevertheless, in his speech in Ashland, Ohio, the president proclaimed his intention to complete the breakdown of the social programs and to abolish that which the American people had achieved after long years of persistent struggle.

The crisis in the American educational system as well became aggravated under the Reagan administration. The situation became so serious that a special group of 41 governors drafted, according to the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, "the most severe accusation of the American educational system since the launching of the first Soviet satellite in 1957." It warned that "the country is in the throes of a wave of mediocrity which threatens the very future of the United States.... Should an unfriendly foreign power try to impose on America the drab and mediocre educational system similar to the one which exists in our country today, we would in all likelihood consider this an act of war."

Concern for the future of the growing generation inspired James Reston, the senior American political commentator, to write in the article "Does He Know His America?" the following: "When Reagan thinks of national security he does not consider the education of American children but thinks of the Soviet Union. He thinks of the military 'window of vulnerability' instead of the vulnerability of a country whose young generation is rather poorly educated, for which reason it is unprepared for the advent of the computer age."

Life to millions of Americans, even to those who could afford material goods, has become an endless nightmare. It has become an endless suffering--spiritual and material--an existence under conflicting circumstances which confuses the mind: tremendous wealth amidst crying poverty, extreme polarization, highly developed culture coexisting with a blossoming pornography, prostitution, all kinds of perversions, a cult of violence and an outburst of drug addiction. Capitalism, which is outliving its century, is not only "devouring" material resources but striking at the moral foundations of the country.

The impression develops that the United States, with its tremendous natural resources and talented, industrious and initiative-minded people, has been attacked by a predatory enemy the purpose of which is to destroy all material and spiritual values which have been created throughout many generations by our workers, scientists and men of culture. The bitter lessons of the war in Vietnam, the Watergate scandal and comprehensive corruption, which has become an inseparable part of the political system, and now the catastrophic consequences of the domestic and foreign policies of the Reagan administration, are proof of the deepening moral and political decline and crisis in the United States and are having an increasing impact on the Americans. No one can live forever on the brink of nuclear catastrophe. The American people cannot endlessly tolerate the casualties, the cost and the shame of aggressive actions in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Lebanon and Namibia, a policy which is dishonoring the United States, the bulwark of the most reactionary forces on earth.

An increasing number of Americans today are realizing that the Reagan administration has become the reason for the greatest difficulties ever encountered by the United States. This view is shared by tens of millions of people on earth. We must not forget, however, that although the nuclear arms race and the threat of thermonuclear war have gained a new qualitative scope and scale under Reagan, the beginning of this course was laid by the previous White House leadership. The MX intercontinental ballistic missile, the cruise missile, the neutron bomb, Directive No 59, the tremendous increase in armaments, the new wave of anti-Sovietism, the grain embargo and the boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics were all the work of the Carter administration. Let us also remember that Weinberger's spiritual predecessor was actually Z. Brzezinski, Carter's national security affairs adviser, one of the most aggressive anti-Soviet state officials in U.S. history. George Kennan, the former American ambassador to Moscow and, incidentally, the author of the notorious "containment policy" during the cold war, warned as early as 1977 (when Reagan was still waiting his turn) of the inadmissibility of the course which is now extensively pursued by official Washington.

What is the nature of this course? The most aggressive and most reactionary monopoly capital circles in the United States and the other NATO countries are convinced that they have acquired a "miracle weapon" which will enable them to achieve that which no other ruling class has been able to accomplish: to terminate the process of progressive development of history and to turn it back. They are thus threatening the peoples on earth, including their own, with total destruction unless the world has been remade as dictated by imperialism. This is an insane, suicidal course currently pursued by extremely thoughtless and aggressive circles in the imperialist countries, the United States above all, which are currently in positions of leadership. It is a course which threatens not only universal peace but the very economic and social fabric of life in the United States and the entire capitalist world. This truth is being increasingly recognized with growing concern by influential representatives of big business and noted Western political and military leaders.

The unprecedented threat to the existence of civilization itself on earth has led to the appearance of a peace movement of unparalleled scale. The nuclear

madness and terrorism, which are the essence of the current U.S. foreign policy, threaten the norms of relations among countries which took years to develop.

In my view, no single U.S. president has triggered such concern and fear in the American people and the rest of the world as Reagan. This has been reflected in the numerous letters which Americans, representing various population strata and age groups, are sending to Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. This is a totally unprecedented phenomenon. Americans extremely rarely send letters to the heads of other countries, not to mention the leading socialist country. To the best of my knowledge, they have never thought of the need directly to address themselves to the head of a country the hatred and fear of which has been persistently instilled in them for over 6 decades. Considering what the current president and his retinue are doing and what they could do, soberly thinking people are increasingly relying on the fact that the USSR could lift the existing danger. The very fact that Americans are addressing themselves to the head of another country proves that they are profoundly concerned with the nature of the social system within which such a monstrous danger is developing.

The threat does not come from the countries of real socialism or the leading socialist state. The efforts to depict the Soviet Union as the "disturber of world tranquility and stability" are failing one after another. The obligation assumed by the United States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the comprehensive and sensible program for lifting the threat of nuclear war, contained in the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact members, and Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statements are having a tremendous beneficial impact thanks to the realistic nature of their approach. They offer an excellent opportunity for comparing and assessing the policy of the two social systems. Although peaceful coexistence is the only sensible course in relations among countries with different social systems (to which there is no sensible alternative, as we read in the historical declaration on the foundations of relations, signed by the heads of state of the United States and the USSR in May 1972), socialism is the firm foundation for a policy of peace and a bastion in the struggle for peace on our planet. No one has called so honestly and openly for a sensible solution of grave international problems as have the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Meanwhile the U.S. administration is doing everything possible to give an ideological coloring to its nuclear terrorism. This is frankly expressed in Reagan's appeal for a "crusade" against communism and his hysterical and hypocritical accusations of a country which has forever ended with the exploitation of man by man and is tirelessly heading the struggle for rescuing the world from nuclear destruction, a country which he has blasphemously proclaimed the "focus of evil." Incidentally, it would be futile to seek in the annals of history and in the greatest works of world literature a character equalling Reagan in terms of the depth of hypocrisy. Moliere's Tartuffe and Dickens' Pecksmith would die of jealousy had they had the opportunity to admire the actions of their follower in the second half of the 20th century.

A qualitatively new stage in the increased nuclear danger began with the deployment of the American Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe. It will take some time for mankind to realize fully its tremendous scale. Clearly, such a process could take more time for the people of the United States, on the territory of which no military operations have been conducted for nearly 120 years. In World War II I was with the 165th Infantry Regiment of the 27th Division in Okinawa. Our division was preparing for the invasion of the Japanese islands when the atom bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I must honestly admit that at that time soldiers and officers welcomed the nuclear weapon as a means for putting a quick end to the war. It was only in connection with the Caribbean crisis of October 1962 that the sinister reality of nuclear war finally touched the conscience of millions of Americans.

The intensive war preparations by the Reagan administration and the unparalleled and unrestrained arms race it has mounted and the beginning of the deployment of first-strike missiles in Europe have all had an impact on the American people contrary to what the nuclear maniacs in Washington hoped for. This forced millions of Americans to realize that never before had their own safety and universal security been more threatened than it had by Reagan's policy of confrontation. This made an increasing number of people realize that our fate, like that of the entire world, largely depends on the state of Soviet-American relations.

The confidence expressed in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's 28 September 1983 declaration to the effect that "mankind has neither lost nor could lose its mind" stands on solid ground. The resolve to act for the sake of the triumph of intelligence over nuclear madness became the motive force of the largest antiwar movement in the history of the United States. This was reflected, in particular, in the reaction of millions of my compatriots to "The Day After," a film produced by ABC. They saw the horrors which they could expect should a nuclear war affect U.S. territory. In reporting on the unprecedented emotional response to the film throughout the country, the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE pointed out that the White House was concerned by such a reaction and "feared a wave of feelings against the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe."

The spreading realization of the danger of the policy pursued by the present Washington administration led to the appearance in the United States of a movement recognizing neither ideological nor political-geographic boundaries. Never before, in the entire history of the United States, have so many Americans opposed the policy of the government. The million-strong peace demonstration of 12 June 1982 in front of the United Nations headquarters and the impressive march on Washington of 27 August 1983, which rallied 400,000 people under the slogan of "Work, Peace, Freedom!" proved that the nationwide movement for the right to life and for peace and progress has sunk deep roots in the United States. In scope it has already exceeded the powerful movement against the "dirty war" in Vietnam. The 27 August march, held on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Martin Luther King's famous "I Have a Dream" speech, rallied three main movements: those of the peace fighters, the participants in the movement for jobs for Americans and the fighters against

racism, which has increased sharply under the Reagan administration. On the initiative of all leading American peace organizations, days of opposition to the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe were held in October 1983 with the participation of hundreds of thousands of people in 300 large cities. Nor did the clergy remain on the sidelines. Despite the increased pressure of the authorities, the heads of the American Roman Catholic Church passed a declaration in which they proclaimed nuclear war immoral and inconceivable. This is an actual condemnation of the policy of the arms race pursued by the government.

The widespread participation of numerous trade unions and organizations of Afro-Americans and Hispano-Americans was a distinguishing feature of such actions. The U.S. Communist Party plays an active role in rallying these three most important currents in the struggle against the domestic and foreign political danger created by the nuclear strategy of the current administration.

Gus Hall, U.S. Communist Party secretary general, noted at the 23rd Congress of the U.S. Communist Party that the Reagan government and Reagan himself have proved themselves to be the most insane and frenzied warmongers. He described stopping the insane course of U.S. imperialism as the main task of the entire world and the American people. As a party acting within the main bulwark of this nuclear madness, the communists realize their particular responsibility to our people, the peoples of the world and the destiny of human civilization. They are firmly convinced that the American people, the working class in particular, is as yet to have its say in the historical struggle for survival and peaceful coexistence and for the right to live in a truly humane world where peace and progress will reign.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

ELECTIONS AND POLITICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 113-117

[Letter to the editors by Andrew Rothstein]

[Text] Andrew Rothstein is one of the oldest British communists. He is president of the Anglo-Soviet Friendship Society and a great and loyal friend of our country. As a noted political personality, major Marxist scientist and outstanding publicist, he is dedicating all of his forces, energy and talent to the dissemination of the truth about the Soviet Union and the development of mutual understanding between our countries and peoples. In September 1983 A. Rothstein was awarded the Order of the October Revolution for his contribution to the struggle for peace and social progress and strengthening friendship and cooperation between the British and Soviet peoples and on the occasion of his 85th birthday.

The 1983 general elections in Britain, which set the political climate in the country for years to come, were of a most specific nature for the entire postwar period. Therefore, their importance should be considered against the background of the electoral struggle which took place in the country at that time.

In the 1945 elections the Labor Party gained not only the absolute majority in the House of Commons but the almost absolute majority of the popular vote (these two indicators rarely coincide because of abuses allowed by the obsolete British electoral system). The results of the elections were of particular importance at that time, for they had been held at the end of World War II in which Winston Churchill, the leader of the conservatives, had played a noted role. It was natural for the conservatives to do everything possible to draw the voters over on their side with the help of his reputation.

The following table shows the dynamics of the votes cast for the main parties since 1945 (in million votes):

	1945	1951	1964	1970	1974	1979	1983
Labor	12.1	14.0	12.2	12.2	11.5	11.5	8.5
Conservatives	10.0	13.7	12.0	10.5	10.5	13.7	13.0
Liberals	2.2	0.7	5.1	5.3	5.3	4.3	7.8

These figures express important political phenomena. First of all, after a long period of Labor Party rule (1945-1951, 1964-1970 and 1974-1979) the number of votes cast for them declined substantially. The reason was that the Labor government proved quite soon that it was acting exclusively as a "guardian" of the capitalist system, creating not even the appearance of any attack on the class privileges of the rich. As a result, considerable groups of voters turned away from it in disgust, saying "you are all the same!" However, the loss of nearly 3 million votes by the Labor Party in 1983 was truly unprecedented.

Secondly, the Labor Party defeat did not mean in the least that the voters who had previously supported it had voted for the Tories, as the latter frequently claim. The beneficiaries were the Liberals, who received the votes of the petite bourgeoisie, which had traditionally voted for them even before the Labor Party had become the main rival of the Tories in 1945 and had subsequently (with fluctuations) supported labor. In 1983 the Conservatives actually lost 700,000 votes (while gaining an additional 58 seats). The dissatisfied industrial workers did not switch to the Conservatives. On election day they simply stayed home. A loss of votes in such cases actually means that the fluctuating petite bourgeoisie and the white-collar workers turn to the "classic" alternative of the Conservatives--the Liberals.

Thirdly, the disappointed Labor voter had the opportunity to turn to a new variety of liberals in the 1983 elections--the so-called Social Democrats, who formed an organization officially independent of the openly capitalist Liberal Party. The first major withdrawal of the petit bourgeois liberal elements from the Labor Party took place in 1981, elements which had predominated within it ever since its founding in the year 1900. This group, mainly consisting of members of Parliament and possible candidate members, joined forces with the Liberal Party and took part in the electoral campaign as a bloc of Liberals and Social Democrats, described as "the alliance." It was precisely thanks to the votes for the candidates from this group (a possible 2,750,000) that the number of votes for the Liberals increased from 4.3 million in 1979 to 7.8 million in 1983. Only a small part of the vote went to the Conservatives.

Fourthly, the figures indicate a growing absenteeism on the part of the voters who actually believe that "all parties are the same." Even in 1945 some 8 million people had abstained. By 1970 the number of abstentions had reached 11 million; in 1983 it totaled 11.5 million of the total 42.5 million registered voters. For understandable reasons, this factor in British elections is usually not mentioned by the bourgeois political parties. Nevertheless, it must always be taken into consideration. It was of exceptional importance in last year's elections, for, in addition to everything else, this group is a tremendous majority of potential voters, who, although feeling the severe consequences of Conservative rule in recent years, did not believe that a Labor government would bring about better times.

In its electoral declaration and the speeches of its candidates the Labor Party emphasized mainly the threat of the growth of unemployment and a decline in living standards. The party also stated, however, that it was particularly concerned with the nuclear arms race and the threat to universal peace.

As to the first problem, the results of the activities of the Thatcher government since 1979 offered a clear confirmation. There were about 5 million unemployed, either registered or unregistered for a variety of reasons, thousands of companies going bankrupt every year, a production drop in excess of 20 percent over 3 years, and a drop in domestic capital investments by 33 percent. Meanwhile, controls over capital exports and the currency rate were lifted. The flow of imports from British "Common Market" "allies" continued without any counterexports. The rate of exchange of the pound sterling was maintained on the international monetary markets by drastic cuts in government expenditures, with the exception of military appropriations which increased by more than 20 percent in 3 years. Under the pretext of lowering governmental expenditures, a large number of state enterprises in industry and services were denationalized. However, this "fight against inflation" did not improve the situation of the average working family.

Furthermore, in a 3-year period the cost of bread had increased by 20 percent, of milk by 50 percent, of beer by 50 percent, of a pack of cigarettes, natural gas and school lunches by 100 percent, rentals in municipally owned housing by 125 percent and medicines by 600 percent. Six million working people subsist below the poverty level, earning less than two-thirds of the average wage of an unskilled worker; 40 percent of the unemployed are individuals under 25; 60 percent of the vocational training courses have been closed down. The country has 26,000 unemployed teachers although there are vacancies in 20 percent of the secondary schools. The cost of a ticket in urban transportation has almost doubled. The suburban and local railroad traffic is pitiful. In the social area, under the guise of "eliminating unnecessary expenditures" and "encouraging self-support" the creation of private hospitals and private medical insurance is encouraged; financial support is given to private schools where tuition ranges from 1,500 to 2,500 pounds sterling per year, thus available only to the rich.

In order to defend this system and these "accomplishments" and to justify the difficulties which are burdening the working people, the Conservatives are waging a well-orchestrated campaign through millions of copies of newspapers and a steady flow of radio and television news. Meanwhile, the Labor Party has not even had its own daily newspaper since 1960. Its leaders have thus had to pay for their long years of reformist policy and aspiration to make their propaganda fit the standards set by the party of the capitalists by refusing to control their own newspaper, the DAILY HERALD, which became a pale shadow of the militant newspaper it was 50 years ago.

The program of the Labor Party to fight this situation was extensive and detailed. It repeatedly noted that it was aimed at taking specific and urgent steps. Naturally, it did not mention socialism as its end objective or a socialist future and, even less so, the class struggle. In their speeches and leaflets the labor candidates did everything possible to advertise their promises. The long legacy of previous labor governments, however, and the repeated violations of their electoral promises were skillfully used by their opponents to revive past disappointments in the minds of the voters. It was in this area that Labor felt acutely the lack of a daily newspaper. It was precisely this that allowed not only the Conservatives but, particularly, the

new "alliance" of Social Democrats and Liberals to neutralize most of the attacks and charges leveled by the Labor Party at the government and if not alienating from the Labor Party politically active industrial workers, at least encouraging them not to vote, thus garnering the almost 3 million votes we mentioned.

Nevertheless, these were secondary difficulties in the electoral campaign of the Labor Party. Even greater difficulties stemmed from the fact that from the very beginning the party had remained totally silent regarding the persistent struggle waged by the Soviet Union for taking balanced and immediate steps for disarmament precisely at a time when the majority of the British people were deeply concerned by the nuclear threat. Therefore, the party failed to make use of the existing political situation in the country and refused to mount an offensive against the Conservatives and to confront doubtful politicians from the Liberal and Social Democratic parties. A citizen of a socialist country would probably find it hard even to imagine the extent to which the tremendous majority of the British people are uninformed on the very existence of Soviet disarmament proposals, not to mention their details. The capitalist press, the radio and the politicians have surrounded them with a thick curtain of silence. The popularization of these proposals by the Labor Party in the course of the electoral campaign would have had an explosive impact.

This will not be questioned by those who recall the mood of the British on the eve of the sudden dissolution of Parliament. The permanent and persistent repetition of facts related to the destructive power of nuclear stockpiles, permanently and persistently repeated by the press and the radio, triggered a virtually comprehensive feeling of depression and fear. The increasingly raving threats and bragging of the Reagan administration faced the Conservative cabinet itself with a real problem, naturally not because the views of the prime minister were basically different from them but because they alarmed ever new masses of people and led them to take the side of the participants in the worker movement and the peace fighters. The number and scale of meetings and demonstrations against the nuclear threat increased rapidly, while nationwide support of the movement by the women who opposed the deployment of American nuclear missiles in Green-Common involved in the struggle population strata which had never before been concerned with such a struggle, particularly many members of the Anglican Church. Matters went so far that the Archbishop of Canterbury (the factual head of the church) and a considerable number of his bishops openly condemned the possibility of a mass destruction of the population anywhere with the use of nuclear weapons. What makes this even more important is the British saying that "the Church of England represents the Conservative Party in prayer"... At the same time the country's Roman Catholic clergy as well voiced such a protest.

Equally noteworthy in the months which preceded the elections was the fact that the leaders of the Labor Party did nothing to break the conspiracy of silence in the press and in Parliament on the specific Soviet proposals made on various aspects of reducing the nuclear threat, which would have been a simple and a necessary answer to the concern of the peoples. The content of these proposals was not disclosed in any single speech by known Labor leaders

or a document published by them. In very rare cases vague references were made to the "views" of the Soviet Union which should be "studied." Even in the long section on peace and disarmament in the electoral declaration of the Labor Party no mention was made of the Soviet proposals. Its authors limited themselves to general views on "the desire for success at the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons," pledges to "support" the reduction of strategic armaments and a declaration to the effect that "Labor has always been against the deployment of SS-20 missiles." Not even a single word was said to the effect that it was the United States which was the first to deploy missiles at this and other stages in the arms race! The only specific demands formulated in the declaration were related to the threat of deploying cruise missiles and Pershings in Western Europe, the presence of American weapons in Great Britain and the UN resolution on freezing nuclear arsenals. Not even the slightest truth may be found to the effect that anyone among the noted Labor leaders exceeded these limits at electoral meetings.

Furthermore, the Labor leaders involved their party in absolutely untimely discussion on one-sided nuclear disarmament as a counterbalance to multilateral disarmament. The polemic which broke out most openly among their own candidates was as sterile as it was out of place, for the NATO countries have been sabotaging multilateral talks for a number of years. Meanwhile, the Labor Party maintained its silence about the fact that the Soviet suggestions would have clearly satisfied the supporters of both "unilateral" and "multilateral" disarmament, had the voters become familiar with them.

The Conservatives used this most stupid polemic which developed at the peak of the electoral struggle by accusing the Labor leaders of their readiness to leave the country "defenseless" in the face of the "Soviet threat." They constantly engaged in the press in a false campaign regarding Soviet domestic and foreign policy, unprecedented in terms of malice and indiscriminate use of means ever since Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald had made public the false "Comintern letter" in October 1924. This, as is well-known, led to the severe defeat of the first Labor government he headed. To this day, in the course of the entire electoral campaign, the Labor leaders did not rebuff the Tories.

The same applies to the raving sallies, which reached the point of an instigation to go to war, which the Conservative leadership allowed against the Soviet Union under those circumstances. On two occasions Prime Minister Thatcher described the USSR as "our worst enemy." Nor did Mrs Thatcher voice a single objection to the ovation which 2,000 young Tory activists gave to a pop artist who shamelessly shouted from the stage "Let us bomb Russia!" Although the Liberal leadership condemned this scandalous fact, only a single Labor candidate of some renown dared to do so.

Therefore, the Labor Party avoided quite deliberately the use of the only truly effective means it had in attacking the Conservative government. One can only guess the reasons for this. However, looking back at the preceding 65 years in the country's political life, the most likely reason, as was the case many years ago, is their greatest mortal fear of being labeled "the Moscow mouthpiece" were they to tell the truth about who is indeed threatening the world with nuclear weapons. This fear had a greater influence on the

Labor leadership than the unprecedented opportunity of winning the elections, which would have at least given it the opportunity to try to eliminate the threat of a world catastrophe.

However painful the results of the elections, which brought about the victory of the Conservatives, may have been to the British people, under these circumstances the task of popularizing the historical Soviet proposals becomes increasingly topical. To this day Britain stands in the center of the aggressive U.S. plans as an "unsinkable aircraft carrier." In the light of Labor's defeat the question particularly arises of finding new means for acquainting the peoples of Europe as a whole, and the British people in particular, in a clear and understandable manner, with the most important concepts of the peace-loving internationalist Soviet foreign policy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

CHEAP SHOW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 118-123

[Article by Melor Sturua, London-Moscow]

[Text] Sunday. London. Hyde Park. Speakers Corner.

From the side or, more accurately, from above, looked at from a helicopter, it looks like a huge trash bag, first packed with garbage and then kicked around. All over the place we see empty beer and soda cans, paper napkins covered with mustard and ketchup, bits of paper and leaflets, posters, banners, discarded old shoes and torn-up Bibles, rags and banana peels. Reclining chairs, which can be rented for 25 pence, are piled up, mercilessly broken, like firewood. Their seats, made of colored polyethylene fabric, flutter in the wind like wild birds winging over the West Indies or the Amazon River delta.

Groups of people stand in this multicolored carousel-mosaic of universal garbage. Their sizes vary. The human mass merges or breaks up like the mercury of a broken thermometer. Eddies, whirlpools and funnels form continuously.

The Speakers Corner is not simply a huge trash bag kicked by a passing drunk or hooligan. The Speakers Corner is a gigantic trash bag into which the Tower of Babel has been miraculously crammed, although all Ciceros, Demosthenes and Mirabeaus speak in English only. Accents are something else. They come in a number of registers, like the organ in Westminster Abbey, from soft, velvety Indian to harsh, bristling American.

The religious preachers stand closer to the grid which separates the Speakers Corner from the ordinary city hubbub. All faiths are represented: Catholic priests in black frocks, Buddhists in their shapeless orange garments, Protestant ministers, dressed like City stockbrokers, and Orthodox priests who look like prerevolutionary coachmen and roughnecks. Here the main audience consists of blacks and women. They are smoking the opium of the people and its invisible smoke blends with the easily recognizable earthly marijuana.

Oldsters--retired and poor--sit on the parapet, leaning against the iron fence. They listen to no one. They have neither the faith nor the desire or the strength to do so. Whenever the sirens of fire trucks, ambulances or police vans begin to wail on the other side of the fence, the oldsters shudder as though hit by an electric shock.

A man is sitting on a folding chair in the center of the religious section of the Speakers Corner. He carries a huge board on which the words "The End Is Near!" is written. The first time I saw him was 20 years ago. He looks even more aged now and the words on the board are even more discolored. He answers to the nickname "Jesus." No one knows or wants to know his real name.

"Hello, Jesus! How many years, how many winters!"

"Jesus" pretends to recognize me. He is good of heart and weak of mind.

"How long have you been sitting here?"

"Thirty-three years."

"What's happening with the end of the world?"

"It has approached by exactly 33 years." "Jesus" points a trembling hand at the mock-up of a missile leaning against the gate. Obviously, this "Jesus" is not so feeble-minded.

Another old resident approaches us. The poster he carries reads "We Shall Rise Again!" and at that point the duo of oldsters, toothless but hopeful, break into a hallelujah. Their mouths and chins move up and down as they squeak, like wooden puppets.

Although politics is closer to daily events than religion, the political speakers have chosen an area in Speakers Corner more distant from the city hubbub, under the widespread boughs of big trees and on the tiny grass plot of Hyde Park. I keep moving from one group of debaters to another. I look and I listen.

A variegated, multilingual and multicolored crowd, literally and figuratively. These are tempered fighters. They have been coming here for decades, every Sunday and in all weather. Some of them polish their oratorical art. Others unburden their hearts, kill time or.... Actually, there are as many reasons for idle talk as there are people. Some I recognize, others I think I do. They are the nucleus of the open-air debate club. Gapers, tourists and sociologists stand around them. The gapers gape, the tourists stare and photograph and the sociologists feel the pulsebeat of society (or so they think). In addition to the gapers, tourists and sociologists, there are the poor, the lovers and the policemen--the bobbies. The poor are alone while the lovers and the policemen walk in pairs. Like mating birds, lovers see and notice no one and nothing. The poor pretend not to be begging while the bobbies pretend not to be watching them and others.

Tarzan's yell, patented by Hollywood since the times of Tony [sic] Weismuller, rends the air. Its author hardly resembles the former Olympic swimming champion, who was the first to play the role of King of the Jungle. He is short, paunchy, of uncertain nationality but entirely certain social origin. It is said of the like that they are not Eton¹ graduates. The rostrum of this

1. Eton College is one of the most exclusive schools in Britain.

paunchy, short Tarzan is a beer case. His political platform is Anglophobia and misogyny.

"Come here, everyone! Everyone to me!" Tarzan shouts. "This is the first and last time that I speak in Hyde Park!" I heard that opening at least 16 years ago. "What kind of country is England and what kind of people are the English?! They drink alcohol at certain hours but eat chips² round-the-clock. Morning chips, daytime chips, evening chips and even at night they eat chips instead of making love! The entire nation is nothing but chips!" So far, everything has been harmless humor. But suddenly, however, the first thunder before the storm is heard:

"And they would like to impose such habits on the entire world! We, however, don't want to drink by Greenwich and fry chips round-the-clock."

"Who are 'we'?" threateningly asks a young Englishman in a polo shirt.

"We, the people."

"What kind of a person are you? You don't even know how to speak English. Do you have a British passport?"

"Imagine, I do."

"I doubt it. But even that does not make you an Englishman."

"Naturally. It is not surprising. Take for example the British Museum, not far from Trafalgar Square. There is nothing English in it. Everything is foreign. Everything is stolen."

Laughter. The boy in the polo shirt is puzzled but is unable to block Tarzan's sally. A slim Englishwoman, leaning on a cane hastens to come to his aid.

"How come you are in our country and what are you doing here?"

"I came by sea, ma'am, to receive my due."

"What due?"

"Everything which you took from us for centuries. When I get it I will leave."

"What would you like to get?" the Englishwoman tries to poke Tarzan in the groin with her cane.

"Ah, woman, woman, take thee to a nunnery or, even better, to the kitchen to fry chips for your husband!"

2. Chips are finely sliced fried potatoes. A favorite English garnish.

A policewoman approaches. Noticing her, Tarzan pathetically exclaims:

"That's how far they have gone--women have seized even London's city police! Who will fry the chips for their husbands while they are arresting us?!"

The boy in the polo shirt, regaining his composure, starts to rant:

"England is the greatest country in the world and the English are the greatest nation. To rule the universe is our divine mission."

"The universe or the world?" Tarzan asks.

"The universe."

Laughter explodes. The crowd which has gathered around the competitors begins to sing "God Save the Queen." The voices of the singers cover the words of the boy who keeps on ranting and threatening someone with his fist, his lips foaming. His words are lost, however, as in a movie, when a clumsy operator loses the sound. The singers finally quiet down and after the last line of the anthem, the boy winds up his speech drowned by the roar.

"In less than 5 years we shall once again lead the universe. Look at the Falklands!"

... No more than a few feet divide two groups of debaters. One of them is flying the flag of the PLO and the other the white Israeli flag with the Star of David. The audience is mixed, however. Jews are listening to Palestinians and Arabs to Jews.

A girl is praising kibbutz life.

"You better tell us about life in Sabra and Shatila!" the crowd shouts.

"Have you seen Auschwitz?" the girl answers. There are tears in her eyes.

"We didn't know that Hitler was an Arab!"

Unexpectedly an Englishman wearing a monocle interjects himself in the Arab-Israeli dialogue.

"Who dares call Hitler an Arab? For us in England, and not in England alone, it is precisely a Hitler that we need. Had there been a Hitler there would have been no Arabs or Jews or other second-rate nations!"

A general indignation explodes. Palestinians and Jews, joining forces, attack the monocled gentleman. Without suspecting it or even less so wishing it, he has done a good deed. Sabra and Shatila and Auschwitz and Majdanek and My Lai have common roots--fascism, racism and hatred of man. For an instant people blinded by hatred have realized this and gained an insight.

Actually, the gentleman with the monocle had supporters as well. One of them, also an Englishman, whose face, hands and clothing or, briefly, entire appearance, show his working origin, says:

"The Arabs are buying out England with their oil-stained dollars! I shed my blood for England to defend it from the Germans but it was captured by Arabs!"

"Not all Arabs are sheiks and dollars are an American currency!" a boy objects. I looked at him with amazement, for he was not an Arab but a Jew, with a black skullcap miraculously holding onto his curly hair.

"Before he seized power Hitler also claimed that the Jews had bought out Germany with marks stained with matzoh bread."

"I am warning you once again: do not mention Hitler's name in vain!" the gentleman with the monocle raises his voice.

"Who are you? Chamberlain? Mosley?"

In any eventuality, the working man stands next to the gentleman. The former speaks with a cockney accent while the latter's is an Oxford accent. They have blended perfectly and are quick on the uptake. I look at this seemingly unnatural pair, to the "dirty" and "clean," as though coming out of Marx's pamphlets, miraculously brought to us from the time the Weimar Republic merged with the "Third Reich." There as well the Prussian barons with their inevitable monocles fraternized with the Lumpens and the bartenders, with stupid working people, "forgiving them" their unbearable stench of cheap beer and sausages, the stench of sweat and uneducated speech, for the sake of the purity of the Aryan race....

Like the mercury spilling out of a broken thermometer, the human mass blends or breaks up. Whirlpools, eddies and funnels appear every minute.

Here is for example an oldster carrying on his chest a poster: "Let me explain to you my way to universal peace." However, although peace, universal peace even more so, is in everyone's mind, the space around him is empty. His way attracts no one, for he himself lacks the art of attracting. The old man mumbles something. I barely hear "On the one hand.... On the other hand"

Unexpectedly a young Englishman, looking as though he had just walked out of an Evelyn Waugh novel, stops in front of the old man. I would not be amazed if he happened to be the chairman of the student debate club in Cambridge. The youngster's look is mocking, hostile, scornful. He listens for a minute to the old man's "On the one hand, on the other hand" and then spitefully asks:

"On what side are you?"

Oblivious to the dirty trick, the oldster answers quite seriously:

"I, on the one hand..."

"On both hands you are an ass, an old ass," the youngster cuts him off. His beautiful face turns ugly. "You were just late when God was handing out brains and a good appearance."

"Perhaps, this is silly, on the one hand. But, on the other..."

The youngster, with the impeccable profile of a Roman patrician, laughs openly in his face....

He is one more failure although, judging by his appearance, he was not late in the least when God was giving brains and beauty. He is even reminiscent of Wilde's Dorian Gray. He is dressed in a beautiful three-piece suit with a bow tie. His long blond hair, with a copper hue, falls on his narrow, noble shoulders. The boy is sitting on a wooden case, drinking a lemonade and explaining to his only listener, a half-naked American girl, the British political system.

"The famous French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, you've heard of him, said that those elected by the people to Parliament must implement their will. In our country, however, a member of Parliament in Westminster does what he wants."

"Why?" lazily asks the half-naked American, who is clearly more interested in the Dorian Gray's double than in the British political system.

"Because those the people elect don't know what the people want."

"And if they did?"

"No one can, it is impossible."

"All I know is that I want a drink." With these words the half-naked American girl flirtatiously takes the soda can from the Englishman. For a second he looks at her silently as she drinks and then, with a hopeless note in a voice, goes on:

"Naturally, Jean-Jacques Rousseau was unfamiliar with England and the English...."

The half-naked American, equally unfamiliar with French enlightenment and British parliamentarianism, sighs and gives the soda can back to the boy. In turn, he apparently does not know American women very well.

But enough about such failures. Let us approach the thick of the crowd surrounding an Indian speaker. He is in national costume. An intelligent face with intelligent, mocking eyes, holding a pair of sunglasses. He puts them on when he listens and takes them off when he speaks.

"So, you have come to Hyde Park, to the Speakers Corner. You have probably been told that this is a microcosm of England, a microcosm of its democracy.

All this, my dears, is nonsense. This is not a microcosm of England but a dump of filth. It is not a microcosm of democracy but its leprosarium. Here they let steam out of the boiler instead of gin out of bottles. They brain-wash and gossip."

The speaker looks at the bobby who has stepped close to the stepladder on which he stands.

"Incidentally, do you know the difference between an American and a British policeman? You don't? Then listen." The Indian takes off his glasses and smiles slyly. "When you ask an American policeman how to get to a certain street he pulls out his gun and shoots you. When you ask the same question of an English policeman he pulls out his Greater London Directory and explains to you at length and in detail where to go, and how many left and right turns to take. But God help you if you follow his advice. If you follow it you will either bump into a wall, if you are lucky, or behind bars, if you are not."

At this point something unheard-of takes place or, in any case, I had never seen anything like. The bobby joined in the discussion! Usually the police walk along Speakers Corner like statues, seeing to the order without interfering in the disorder. They are not concerned with verbal skirmishes which are the job of informers. And here hands are not used. Even in the most heated battles, when the people are nose-to-nose and are desperately gesticulating, nothing happens. A good punch in the mouth or even a symbolic slap in the face are as impossible at Speakers Corner as swimming on the moon.

"If it weren't for us you would slice each other's throats," grumbled the bobby, stung to the quick. "Look at what's happening in Sri Lanka."

"You are not interested in the fate of Sri Lanka. You worry about the British tourists in Sri Lanka. You are pursued as if by a boomerang, by your old sins. Wherever the British have gone they have promoted strife which is the legacy of British colonialism.... Recently an English acquaintance of mine rang me up. He too was interested in what was happening in Sri Lanka. I asked him what was happening in Northern Ireland. For some reason he hung up on me."

The Englishman in the three-piece suit and the half-naked American girl show up suddenly.

"We gave you civilization! Without us you would still be like animals!" shouts the modern copy of the portrait of Dorian Gray, having forgotten Jean-Jacques Rousseau and other lofty matters.

The half-naked American girl is trying to calm him down and begs him not to enter into an argument.

"Mind your own business. We gave to you as well, to the Americans, a civilization, but you don't know how to handle it. That is why there is confusion in the world. When Britain ruled the seas everyone knew his place."

The Indian pretends to come to the aid of the flabbergasted girl.

"You American?"

"Yes."

"Rich?"

"No. All I have is on me."

"Not 'on me,' but 'with me.' Actually, this too is plenty."

They all look at the half-naked daughter of America, generously endowed by nature, and laugh gaily.

"What's with you Americans, even poor, that you don't want to stay home?" the Indian asks. "Yankee, go home!" Then he asks more gently, "Well, where were you and what have you seen?"

"I was in Scatland."

"Not Scatland but Scotland."

"This is our American accent."

"Oy, oy, there is accent and no dollars. Did you see the Loch Ness monster?"

"No."

"And the 'Polarises?'"

"Neither."

"Oy, oy, there is an accent but no eyes. You better hold on to your English friend. He is rich," the Indian makes a calculated pause, "in ideas and fluids."

Having dealt with the half-naked Yankee, the Indian takes on "Dorian Gray."

"You have flouted Western civilization to us. I have traveled around the world and have seen a great deal. Are you familiar with the Reperbahn in Hamburg? There naked girls ride numbered horses. You can order one by telephone. In Paris, on the Place Pigalle women are engaged in poisoning dogs. Actually, let us give the French their due. They are not racists. Some dogs were black."

The speaker cleans his sunglasses with a huge colored handkerchief for the passions and feelings to cool off.

"Any questions?" he asks, completing his manipulation with the glasses.

"Teach us how to live like humans!" This is not a question but a cry of despair. "So, that's what you want, to live a human life.... To do this you must either eliminate more quickly the sahibs on earth or go to heaven before they do. The former is difficult but understandable; the second is easy but hard to understand. Let me explain: if the English would go to heaven before us they would introduce immigration laws for the colored, after which we would no more see heaven than our own ears."

Like the mercury of a broken thermometer the human mass blends and then scatters....

A lonely, huge Negro stands somewhat aside. He has the muscles of Antheus and the face of a child. Judging by his poster, he is the founder of a new religion. Judging by the emptiness surrounding him, he is the sole prophet and sole follower of that religion.

"Come to me! I know the way to heaven where champagne is drunk 24 hours a day!"

Apparently to this black "Antheus," champagne is the symbol of the "good life," inaccessible on earth. Clearly, this black "Antheus" has never drunk or even touched it with his lips.

"What brand?" asks a member of the "upper classes" approaching him.

The black is troubled. Naturally, he is unfamiliar with any brand, he has never heard of them or tasted them. Champagne is champagne, and that is all he knows. He knows it purely theoretically. Somewhat hesitantly the black answers:

"Any kind."

"If it is so good in heaven why are you still on earth?" the gentleman from the "upper classes" continues to needle the "prophet."

"I am a teetotaler."

The gentleman giggles. I, however, look in the eyes of the black and believe him. Not his religion or champagne in the sky but the fact that he is a teetotaler. Holy simplicity.... yet how hopeless!

"Any Indian tea in your heaven?" the gentleman continues with the mockery.

"Yes," answers the black, more confidently. Unlike champagne, to him tea is something real, conceivable.

"Brazilian coffee?"

"Yes, yes!"

"Coca-cola?"

"Naturally, yes!" The black smiles happily. He is now in his element, coming down from champagne in the sky to earthly Coca-Cola. He does not even suspect that he has fallen in the trap laid by the gentleman.

"Then why the hell go to heaven? There is tea and Coca-Cola here. Drink until you burst."

The black realizes that he is being made fun of. Although his sculptored biceps unwittingly tighten, the eyes of the "prophet" show not indignation but sadness slightly washed by pain. And I, the atheist, unwittingly take his side.

Having disposed of the "prophet," the gentleman starts looking for a new victim. He is wearing a lightweight black suit. His fingers are covered with rings. He is wearing a gold watch, a charm bracelets, more bracelets and a chain. He looks amazingly like the famous American movie star Marlon Brando, not the young one with Napoleon's profile or of the beat generation but an older, paunchier Brando gone to pieces, as I remember him from the movie "Apocalypse Now," directed by Francis Ford Coppola.

Finally, "Brando" focuses on a Bible-holding Indian woman.

"Slave, how do you dare to be here? I have four maids like you and all of them know their place."

"Why are you insulting this elderly woman?" a young Arab stands up for her.

"Don't play lawyer. I know you. You are the garbageman at the Dorchester Hotel. You stink of muck a mile away."

A crowd begins to assemble around "Brando," the Indian woman and the Arab.

"Ah, the kikes have come," he laughs. "Follow me, I shall take you to the promised land. I am Moses without a beard. Line up."

The Indian woman, who has not understood the sarcasm, turns to the crowd:

"Don't follow him! He will take you to hell."

"Silence, old woman! You are not supposed to resist evil."

"I have been told that before. But remember that today God is the savior, tomorrow he is the judge."

"Do you dare to threaten me! Get out. Get out of England! That is how low we have sunk. True, the government may be conservative but the country is leaning to the left. We need Cowboy Reagan."

"Brando" begins to scream:

"Long live the Tories! Long live Reagan! Long live South Africa!"

"Wipe the foam off your mouth!" the young Arab tells him.

"And you wipe off your snot and march back to the Dorchester to clean the toilets!"

"Brando" extracts an enormous cigar from the inside pocket of his vest, bites off the end and spits it into the face of the Indian woman. Someone obligingly clicks his lighter. "Brando" takes his time, blows smoke in the eyes of the Arab and, cutting across the crowd, marches toward "Jesus." As he walks he kicks into the dirt postcards on religious subjects and lays his hands on the black girls selling them.

"I forgive you all your sins, black pigs, I heal you from mange and leprosy, dirty beasts!"

Finally, "Brando" reaches "Jesus."

"Well, shall we sing Hallelujah?"

"Jesus" happily agrees. They start singing some kind of psalm. "Jesus" sings with self-abandon, while "Brando" is clowning.

"Enough," "Brando" says after a few verses. "Now lift your board higher."

"Jesus" lifts above his head the board with the words "The End Is Near."

"Higher, you old gelding, higher!"

"Jesus" stretches, wavering, on his folding chair.

"That's it," "Brando" remarks approvingly.

If I could I would stand this "Voltaireian" up against a wall...

Meanwhile, Speakers Corner goes on, seething in turbulence. The organization of Iranian students is demanding someone's death penalty. An American shorn like a Buddhist monk calls upon his audience to gather the love scattered in the cosmos. A Japanese, looking more like a traveling salesman than a preacher, claims that the best goods in the world are "made in Japan." A son of the empire in which the sun never set, unable to tolerate the boasting of the son of the country of the rising sun shouts:

"Where is your own 'made in Japan' stamp, you monkey." Salutory British humor....

A debate on "from Moses to Marx" is under way next to the stand selling hot dogs and apple juice. I hear bits of conversation:

"Why is the huge United States afraid of small Nicaragua?"

"It is afraid not of Nicaragua but of socialism..."

"Ah, you like the Russians but not their system? And I like neither the Americans nor their system...."

"Hitler!"

"Reagan!"

"You have a job? I don't. You pay taxes? I don't...."

"All the Indians have become mailmen."

"That is why the mail is slow...."

"God has made two races, the human and the English."

"God made only the English. All others are monkeys."

"If there is war there won't be unemployment."

"There has been, there is and there will be unemployment before, during and after a war."

"After a war there would be no one and nothing left."

How much, it turns out, one could squeeze out of "from Moses to Marx!"

... An unexpected shower bursts with no artillery barrage of thunder. Caught unawares, Speakers Corner--speakers, preachers, and the crowd--abandon the glade like a disturbed gypsy camp, retreating in disorder into the London catacombs--the widespread underpasses under Park Lane, leading to the Oxford Street and Marble Arch subway stops. The debaters keep abusing each other on the march, crushing each other and creating traffic jams.

All life has gone underground like water. It has not dried out but has merely changed its bed. The center of events has shifted to the cement platform underground. Here the attention of the wet crowd is captured by the street escape artist. I recognized him immediately. I saw him for the first time almost 20 years ago, watching him get rid of chains and a canvas bag. True, this was not under Park Lane but in front of the Tower.

Already then the escapist was no longer young. He earned his bread with the sweat of his brow and this showed on his deeply lined face. He earned it with the power and flexibility of his well-trained body. What struck me then was this head of an old man on the body of a youngster. His entire wardrobe consisted of a pair of rust-colored canvas trousers. Both the bag and the chains were the same color. The hands and feet of the escape artist would be chained, he would be put inside the bag which would be bound tight with a cord. The man inside the bag would begin to move along the bridge and in slightly more than a minute he would be free of the bag, the ropes and the chains.

How much water has flowed since then along the Thames under Tower Bridge! The escape artist is now totally worn out, in both face and body. Muscles no longer bulge under the yellowed old skin. He was wearing the same or similar rust-colored trousers and was being tied inside the same or a similar canvas bag.

Only the chains, and I am ready to swear to it, were both different and the same. For several decades and thousands of times he had freed himself from them without becoming free, for it is they that nourished him. His temporary freedom from the steel chains brought him a few copper pennies. The tragedy, however, is that the loss of the chains means the loss of the piece of bread.

Looking at the old escape artist or, rather, the bag which was twisting under the Speakers Corner, I saw that it would be difficult to find or even invent a more suitable symbol for this cheap show of democracy--on the surface--now empty under the pouring rain....

The escape artist's assistant was a man with the face of John the Baptist. He too was an old acquaintance of mine and he too was not spared by time. At that time he looked like a living John the Baptist, angry and accusing. Now a pair of dulled eyes of a chopped head were staring at me. They were accompanied by an armless and legless cripple playing a mouth harmonica. Quartered by fate and forever nailed to an orthopedic wheelchair, by some kind of miracle he held with his stump his simple musical instrument and carefully applied to it his grey, trembling lips.

... Before buying a subway ticket and going to my temporary London residence in Shepherd's Bush in Kensington, I decided to take a final look at Speakers Corner. Protecting myself from the rain with a pile of newspapers taken from a trashcan, I walked out of the underpass. Speakers Corner was empty like airless space. It no longer reminded me of a huge trash bag which had been first packed and then kicked aside. The rain had changed its appearance and a new vision came out: a barren ocean shore on which the stormy waves had deposited the flotsam--old, rotten snags, algae, planks, barrels, rags from sails and all sorts of other things which make us think of a tragic shipwreck somewhere far beyond the horizon of the ocean and the imagination.

Only the police were pacing along the empty cheap show of democracy. They and, standing out alone in the center of Speakers Corner, close to the gate, was "Jesus." He was vainly trying to protect himself from the merciless and penetrating force of the flood with his plywood board with the inscription "The End Is Near!"

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

SCORCHING LINES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 124-127

[Review by V. Arkhipenko of the book "Pis'ma Slavy i Bessmertiya" [Letters of Glory and Immortality]. Letters of revolutionaries, who fell in the struggle for the proletarian revolution and the victory of the Soviet system in Russia from 1905 to 1922. Third enlarged edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 286 pp]

[Text] "There are only two of us left -- Ivan Mostovykh and Antrop Pavlov -- from the entire covering detachment. Long live soviet power. We shall not surrender Siberia to Kolchak. Comrades, avenge the partisans." This note was accidentally found by fishermen on the shore of Derna, a small Ural river, stored in a bottle buried in the ground. The almost unreadable date on the yellowed paper, deciphered with difficulty, was 20 October 1918.

Regional study experts established that it was precisely here, not far from Kamyshlovo a red detachment was desperately defending itself against pressing Kolchak forces. No information could be found on the authors of the note. Nevertheless, these few scorching lines resurrected in the memory the tragedy which had taken place here, shedding light on a civil war event and telling of the boundless courage of the fighters for a Soviet system....

The note found near Kamyshlovo is only one of dozens of dying messages included in the book under review. They were written between 1905 and 1922, a rather short period of time on the scale of history, but one which included three Russian revolutions and the civil war. Behind each one of them stands a person with a unique destiny, undefeated by tortures, aware that his hours and minutes were numbered. These last letters were created sometimes in casemates and in solitary confinement, on prison hospital beds, in basements and sheds...

These short and hastily written notes found their way to the jailed comrades or passed on by guards, who, despite severe penalties, had decided to fulfill the last request of the doomed. They were written on bits of paper, on the margins of books, or scratched with nails on walls and cots. Some of the letters included in the book were found by fellow fighters in the clothing of executed heroes, who had been unable to pass them on in their final hour. The message of the partisans fighting Kolchak had remained in the ground for almost 45 years. The letter by Black Sea sailor Aleksandr Petrov, executed in 1905, had to wait even longer. It was discovered as late as 1963 when the old

stone wall of the former Sevastopol jail was torn down. Some of the letters which had been passed on to relatives, comrades or loved ones a long time ago had been kept for many years in the family archives.

Assembled, these lines have made a book which brings to our contemporaries the spirit of the fighters who died a premature death in the revolutionary battles. It is a difficult book to read. Each letter is the last gleam of a still living and pulsating mind, a cluster of human emotions and an effort to assess in the final hour of death one's experience and to express and pass on the main thing which makes worth living, fighting and dying.

No, it is not accidental in the least that we see in most of the preserved messages the desire to answer the question posed by fate: Why, in the name of what am I leaving this life before my coevals and comrades? The question is answered by the interpretation of accomplishments and the firm conviction that the road which was chosen and covered was the right one. No personal reasons are contained in any of the lines or words. To these writers the fate of the people comes first.

"We are dying in the struggle for freedom and the better future of the entire Russian people." These were the words of Anton Kostyushko-Valyuzhanich, a professional revolutionary about to be executed by firing squad about himself and his comrades.

"For the happiness of the people, to whom wish a better lot." This was the answer to the question asked of seaman Nikolay Komarnitskiy, who took part in the 1906 Kronshtadt rebellion.

"For the suffering and oppressed people," wrote before his execution Ivan Yakutov, fitter at the Ufa railroad workshops, who was hanged in the prison's courtyard in November 1917.

"For the sacred cause of the struggle and happiness of the people." These words belong to Sergeant Sergey Slastunov, who was buried alive into the ground by the Semenov people.

"For the liberation of the working people." Excerpt from the last letter of Aleksandr Mel'nikov, chairman of the Katav-Ivanovskiy Soviet of People's Deputies, tortured by the White Guards in Zlatoust.

In the other letters as well priority is given to the fate of the people, to the just cause and social justice. Some of the writings of the very last minute are extremely brief: "I am dying for the truth."

It was for the sake of great and noble objectives that the revolutionaries parted with a life in which everything took second place to the bright ideals. Many among those whose immortal writings we read today were perfectly aware of what was threatening them. The letter by smelter Grigoriy Tkachenko-Petrenko, one of the 32 Yekaterinoslav workers sentenced by the tsarist court to death by hanging for their participation in the December 1905 armed uprising read: "...I am going to the gallows with a firm step, looking death in the eyes with good cheer and courage, and death cannot frighten me for, as a revolutionary,

I knew that I will not be patted on the head for defending our class interests. I was able to fight and, as you can see, I also know how to die for our common cause like an honest man."

The people whose messages have reached us had no reason to blush for having lived without a purpose. In his prison hospital bed, worker poet Aleksey Gmyrev, dying of tuberculosis, wrote his last poem:

I've lived my life. Looking back,
I see my distant youth,
All in the flame of battles, on top of barricades,
And in my hand, the bright flag of my will.

Entirely justified pride. Other revolutionaries as well speak of barricades and revolutionary battles in the letters-testaments. Their main last instruction to the living, their last wish and desire is precisely for their comrades to continue the struggle against the enemy they started. From Kolchak's prison Siberian clandestine workers Aleksandr Maslennikov, Pavel Vavilov and Mikhail Rabinovich turn to their comrades: "Please comrades, do not regret our departure from this world but continue our struggle against the bourgeois scum." Stepan Alaverdyan, Bagrat Garibdzhanyan and Sarkis Musayelyan, three rebels sentenced by the Dashnaks, bequeath to their comrades: "May our death triple your strength. Show no faint-heartedness."

The passionate appeal of all behests is the following: Take our common cause to its victorious completion. What is noteworthy is that no one expresses even the slightest doubt as to its final victory. In the distant year 1909, dying of consumption, Sormovo worker Petr Shchepetil'nikov, who escaped from Siberian exile and reached Switzerland, wrote to his friends in Russia: "To me socialism and its inevitable advent are as clear and understandable and as irrefutable as my desire to eat, drink and sleep."

Like the streams which gather to form mighty rivers, these assembled final letters are to us a river of the bright optimism of the fighters. Inflexible confidence is shown by the young underground worker Margarita Kostyanovskaya, that not a single drop of the blood shed by the fallen fighters will be in vain, by the professional revolutionary Ivan Valikov, that the revolution to which he has given his all will live, by the Don Cossack Mikhail Krivoshlykov, that the truth cannot be killed, and by the nine Odessa bolsheviks, sentenced by the Denikin forces to death by firing squad, that the ideals of communism are bound to prevail.

Virtually all those who wrote to their comrades, friends and relatives tried to describe their emotional state. It was very important to them for the people to know that they were facing their final hour without fear, morally undefeated, with inflexible firmness and hatred and scorn for the enemy.

Naturally, parting with life was not easy... In his letter to his family, writing from the White Guard Orenburg prison, 22-year old Ivan Dukhanin admits that "I so much wanted to live, but they are depriving me of my life." Roza Kasparova, 23-year old member of the Armavir underground, uses virtually the same words: "I terribly want to live. But down with the dark thoughts,

otherwise people may think that I am afraid of death." The overwhelming majority of the messages which have come to us express the idea that there is no fear of death when it is accepted for the sake of the victory of the common cause which one has served with dedication.

The sole regret is their failure to have accomplished more. "I regret that I have done so little work for the revolution," is a thought repeated word for word in many last notes. That and the fact that they will die not in battle, not arms in hand. Wounded and captured regimental commander Andrey Fevralev-Savel'yev seems to address himself to the heart when he writes from the Grozno jail: "I would have liked to die in battle, like a Red commander. My fate, however, will be apparently to die from a bourgeois rope."

The last messages of the revolutionaries carry a tremendous explosive charge. They clearly showed to their comrades the strength and greatness of their spirit, called for new battles and instilled faith in the inevitable victory. Published, they became weapons in the struggle waged by thousands and thousands of new fighters. Since the days of the first Russian revolution the fiery messages from behind the walls of the casemates were reprinted in newspapers and leaflets and transcribed by hand. During the civil war they were read to the ranks on the eve of battles. Penetrating deeply into the minds, they turned into powerful incentives for action and help to surmount even the most incredible difficulties and adversities. Their impact remains tremendous to this day. Although addressed to their contemporaries, most frequently to specific individuals, these letters last testaments also proved to be addressed to their descendents, to the present and future generations. Following their publication in newspapers and journals, such messages sent by the participants in the revolutionary struggle, discovered in recent decades, have invariably triggered a flood of emotional responses and created a profound interest in the authors of such heart-rending lines.

The authors themselves were different. The book brings together the writings of stone masons, physicians, seamen and officers, rural poor and members of the hereditary nobility, semi-literate cossacks and noted lawyers, youngsters engaging in the struggle and professional revolutionaries. The oldest, Andrey Chumak, was 42 and the youngest, Viktor Gepp, only 17. These were people of different social origins, nationalities and professions, with very different practical experience and of quite disparate natures. Nevertheless, they were all like-minded, all united through their affiliation with the bolshevik party and their common moral foundations. The collective portrait of the communist appears from the mosaic of these combined writings, clearly depicting the meaning and essence of his life, clarity of spiritual positions and purposefulness of action.

Some of the letters are from people who happened to find themselves in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle in Russia. One of them was Jeanne Labourbe, who had come to our country in search of employment and who, several years later, had become the legendary heroine of the Odessa underground; the Austrian soldier Joseph Konrad, who fought shoulder to shoulder with the Russian Red Army men in the Far East; and the Hungarian Karoj Ligeti, who took part in the civil war in Siberia. Not a single one of them wavered when in enemy hands and not one of them agreed to abandon his chosen path.

One of the internationalists, a former officer in the Austro-Hungarian army, wrote a letter to the military tribunal which had sentenced him to death by firing squad. He did not ask the executioners for mercy, nor did he justify his actions. He objected not to the death sentence but to the senseless accusation of the judges who had accused him of being an agent of the German General Staff. With a feeling of pride in his destiny and scorn for the executioners, he wrote: "Now, for the first time in my life I was truly aware of what I was fighting for. The army in whose ranks I fought also knew this to the last man. You, gentlemen, do not know why you are hanging people. If you were to learn the reason today you would have hanged yourselves immediately."

These human documents which appeared, as we pointed out, under a specific situation and were addressed to specific individuals confirm the strength of the spirit and the mood of the fighters without always providing a clue to their past, the circumstances which had led them to the revolution, the conditions under which their personalities had been shaped and the trials they had undergone. The comments in the book supply this information. It is quite important that such comments play an active and, sometimes, even an independent rather than auxiliary role. The final note written by Georgiy Tsagolov contains no more than a few words, but the comments about it tell us that he entered the path of struggle as a very young man and that he became one of the organizers of the Soviet system in the Northern Caucasus and head of the Ossetian Revolutionary Council. He was only 20 years old when he was wounded and fell into the hands of the Denikin people.... Having become familiar with his biography, we reread the short note in which the young revolutionary speaks with such great confidence of the future communist society with a sharpened eye.

The comments acquaint us with dozens of biographies. Some of them are those of noted revolutionaries, such as Grigoriy Usiyevich, Stepan Shaumyan, Nikolay Rudnev and Sergey Lazo. In the case of most of the heroes, however, this is their first biography. Unfortunately, it has been rarely possible to describe such people in detail for lack of documents or the testimony of witnesses. The book includes the powerful message sent from the Omsk jail to the comrades, first published in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA SIBIR in December 1919. However, neither during those long-gone days nor in the intervening decades has it been possible to find out even the last name of the courageous heroes Sasha and Kirill, who in their final hour thought not of themselves but of cheering up their comrades "in the struggle against injustice and vileness."

However, during the 20 years which have passed since the book was published in its first edition, dozens of new letters, documents and newspaper materials from the distant past have been found. This has made it possible to expand and enrich the collection considerably. Both the previous and the latest editions have sold out quickly although the book has been published in a total of 725,000 copies. This convincingly proves the tremendous interest shown by the readers in the fate of the heroes of the revolutionary struggle.

Naturally, the search is not over. In all likelihood by far not everything contained in the prerevolutionary publications, newspapers and journals of the civil war and the 1920s has been found. Unexpected discoveries may also be

made in family files, as was the case, for instance, of the note by Fedor Mantulin, a participant in the barricade battles of Krasnaya Presna. The note, which was found by his friend a week after the worker-soldier was executed by firing squad, it was delivered to the family of the hero. However it was only recently, in 1983, that it became familiar to hundreds of thousands of people as part of the book.

The search is being continued by historians, journalists and public figures. As more material accumulates another expanded edition may become necessary. Unquestionably, like all others, it will find interested readers and trigger a new flood of emotional responses.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/7

SHORT BOOK REVIEWS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) pp 127-128

[Text] Yu. A. Lukin. "Ideologiya i Khudozhestvennaya Kul'tura"
[Ideology and Artistic Culture]. Iskustvo, Moscow, 1982. 247 pp.
Reviewed by M. Glotov.

The development of the mature socialist society and the sharp aggravation of the ideological confrontation between the forces of progress and reaction in the international arena have given a main role to the problem of the relationship between politics and ideology, on the one hand, and the spiritual world of modern man, including artistic culture, on the other. Lukin's book deals precisely with this important topic. On the basis of the philosophical legacy of the founders of scientific communism, the programmatic documents of the CPSU and the other communist parties in the socialist commonwealth and the works by Marxist scientists, the author deals with the many-faceted question of the relationship between ideology and artistic culture and firmly rebuffs the ideologues of anticommunism, opportunism and revisionism. He concentrates on the theoretical substantiation of the concept according to which "communist ideology is a basis for the successful development of socialist culture, literature and art. In turn, socialist artistic culture helps in the dissemination and assertion of communist ideology" (p 60).

In the author's view, artistic culture may not be reduced to a sum total of artistic values only. It must be interpreted in broader terms, as a complex system within which such values are created, disseminated and consumed. In Lukin's opinion such a view of artistic culture requires the development of a special theory of artistic culture, the main structural subdivisions in which should be the general theory of artistic culture and its history, sociology, economics and management. The content of the main aspects of the general theory of artistic culture is presented in the book through the lense of the study of the establishment of socialist artistic culture, its levels, development patterns, accomplishments and tasks.

Any work of art which expresses the attitude of the artist toward the world, man and society and his class likes and dislikes, the author emphasizes, is a powerful means of ideological education, shaping the person's life stance and outlook. That is why art is deeply party-minded and ideological in nature. Taken in the totality of its social functions, art acts as a tool in the study of life, a source of esthetic joy and a "factor of spiritual and practical

influence on reality with a view to its transformation and perfection" (p 71). In emphasizing that art is one of the forms of expression of ideology, the author insists that "we find the complete blending of the artist with ideology in proletarian and socialist artistic culture and in its best classical works" (p 82). The work also discusses the specifics of the feedback of art on ideology, which is that art can penetrate all realms of human life and influence them deeply. "It is no accident, therefore, that artistic culture, with its truly unique ability comprehensively to influence the social consciousness, the education process and the individual, is given such a great place of honor in party ideological work" (pp 138-139).

The various aspects of the interaction between socialist artistic culture and CPSU ideological and educational work are analyzed in the book in the course of the interpretation of problems of the class approach to cultural legacy. The author draws attention to the paths leading to the implementation of Lenin's behest: culling from each national culture "only its democratic and socialist elements" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 24, p 121). Lukin particularly emphasizes the increased role of artistic culture in the developed socialist society and the need to improve its management. This inevitably raises the question of shaping the creative activeness of the masses through art.

The work is distinguished by a deep and comprehensive theoretical approach to the formulation and resolution of the topical problems of the interrelationship between artistic culture and ideology and its sharp polemics and class orientation in the exposure of the distortions of Marxism-Leninism by its sworn enemies and in criticism of some researchers who allow methodological errors in their interpretation of the cultural legacy of the past. The extensive volume of data and reliance on theoretical and specific sociological sources, based on the tasks of building communism and formulated in the resolutions of the 24th-26th CPSU congresses, allow the author convincingly to prove that all artistic practices in our century confirm the accuracy of Marxist-Leninist theoretical stipulations to the effect that under the conditions of the aggravated class struggle in the international arena and the confrontation between socialist and bourgeois ideologies the ideological nature of art is becoming increasingly obvious while its ties to politics become greater.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 84 (signed to press 3 Jan 84) p 128

[Text] 1. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, 26-27 Dekabrya 1983 Goda" [Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 26-27 December 1983]. K. M. Bogolyubov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 31 pp.

2. Romanov, G. V. "Velikaya Zhiznennaya Sila I dey i Dela Oktyabrya" [The Great Vital Power of the Ideas and Actions of October]. Report at the ceremonial session dedicated to the 66th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 5 November 1983. V. G. Zubarev responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 31 pp.

3. Ustinov, D. F. "Borot'sya za Mir, Ukrepyat' Oboronosposobnost'" [To Struggle for Peace and Strengthen Defense Capability]. S. F. Akhromeyev responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 16 pp.

4. Volkogonov, D. A. "Psikhologicheskaya Voyna" [Psychological Warfare]. Subversive imperialist actions in the field of social consciousness. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1983, 288 pp.

5. "Voprosy Razvitiya Mirovoy Sotsialisticheskoy Sistemy" [Problems of the Development of the World Socialist System]. By a group of authors. A. S. Vishnyakov general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 176 pp.

6. "Za Mir, Razoruzheniye i Bezopasnost' Narodov" [For Peace, Disarmament and Security of the Peoples] Chronicle of USSR foreign policy. N. I. Lebedev general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 432 pp.

7. "Mezhdunarodnyye Konflikty Sovremennosti" [International Conflicts of Our Time]. V. I. Gantman responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 407 pp.

8. "Problemy Kommunisticheskogo Dvizheniya. 1982 God. Mezhdunarodnoye Kommunisticheskoye Dvizheniye i Dva Napravleniya v Mirovoy Politike" [Problems of the Communist Movement. 1982. The International Communist Movement and Two Directions in World Politics]. Yearbook. Yu. N. Pankov general editor. Mysl', 1983, 319 pp.

9. "Razoruzheniye: Kto Protiv?" [Disarmament: Who Is Against?] Voenizdat, Moscow, 1983, 96 pp.

10. Razumov, Ye. Z. "Problemy Kadrovoy Politiki KPSS" [Problems of CPSU Cadre Policy]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 192 pp.

11. "Spravochnik Propagandista-Mezhdunarodnika" [Reference Book for the International Affairs Propagandist]. V. V. Zagladin and N. V. Shishlin general editors. Compiled by N. K. Golovko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 205 pp.

12. "S Chego Nachinayetsya Lichnost'" [Beginning of the Personality]. R. I. Kosolapov general editor. Second edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 360 pp.

13. Tsipko, A. S. "Nekotoryye Filosofskiye Aspekty Teorii Sotsializma" [Some Philosophical Aspects of the Theory of Socialism]. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 216 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/7

END